arXiv:hep-th/9202046v1 14 Feb 1992

CERN-TH.6380

Duality Anomaly Cancellation, Minimal String Unification and the Effective Low-Energy Lagrangian of 4-D Strings

Luis E. Ibáñez

and

Dieter Lüst[⋆]

CERN, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract

We present a systematic study of the constraints coming from target-space duality and the associated duality anomaly cancellations on orbifold-like 4-D strings. A prominent role is played by the modular weights of the massless fields. We present a general classification of all possible modular weights of massless fields in Abelian orbifolds. We show that the cancellation of modular anomalies strongly constrains the massless fermion content of the theory, in close analogy with the standard ABJ anomalies. We emphasize the validity of this approach not only for (2,2) orbifolds but for (0,2) models with and without Wilson lines. As an application one can show that one cannot build a $\mathbf{Z}_3$ or $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold whose massless charged sector with respect to the (level one) gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ is that of the minimal supersymmetric standard model, since any such model would necessarily have duality anomalies. A general study of those constraints for Abelian orbifolds is presented. Duality anomalies are also related to the computation of string threshold corrections to gauge coupling constants. We present an analysis of the possible relevance of those threshold corrections to the computation of $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3 for all Abelian orbifolds. Some particular *minimal* scenarios, namely those based on all $\mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds except $\mathbf{Z}_6$ and $\mathbf{Z}'_8$, are ruled out on the basis of these constraints. Finally we discuss the explicit dependence of the SUSY-breaking soft terms on the modular weights of the physical fields. We find that those terms are in general not universal. In some cases specific relationships for gaugino and scalar masses are found.

⋆ Heisenberg Fellow

January 1992

1. Introduction

Four-dimensional superstrings [1] constitute at the moment the best candidates for unification of all interactions. In trying to use these theories to describe the observed physics, it is of fundamental importance to obtain the effective low-energy field theory of each given 4-D string. Much progress along these lines has been achieved in the last few years and there is at present a good knowledge of the form of the effective Lagrangian for the case of orbifold-like 4-D strings.

One of the general features found is that the kinetic term of the matter fields is not canonical but presents a σ-model structure, which depends on the moduli fields of the orbifold variety. Furthermore, the effective Lagrangian is in general invariant under certain duality symmetries acting on the moduli space. In many cases, in particular orbifolds, these symmetries always contain the subgroup $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})^3$ [2], i.e. three copies of the modular group acting on the moduli of each of the three orbifold complex planes. The required target space modular invariance provides a connection between the effective Lagrangian and the theory of modular functions [3]. The effective tree-level Lagrangian of orbifolds has been found to be invariant under these symmetries and the Yukawa couplings to transform as modular functions of definite modular weight [4,5]. The same invariance has been checked in one-loop string computations [6,7] and indeed it is expected on general grounds that these modular symmetries will survive non-perturbative effects and that they may be broken only spontaneously, but not explicitly [8]. This is important because it implies constraints on the possible form of non-perturbative string effects, as remarked in refs.[3,8,9,10]. In the present paper we analyze several different contexts in which the $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})^3$ symmetry of orbifold 4-D strings constrains the low-energy effective field theory. The crucial ingredient in these constraints is the cancellation of "duality anomalies".

The structure of the paper is as follows. In section two, after discussing the duality-invariant structure of the effective low-energy Lagrangian of 4-D strings, we concentrate on the orbifold case. We classify all the possible modular weights for matter fields in arbitrary Abelian $\mathbf{Z}_N$ [11,12] and $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ [13] orbifolds. We also show how the available ranges for modular weights depend on the Kac–Moody level of the gauge algebras.

In section three we discuss the constraints on the massless particle content of 4-D strings coming from cancellation of duality anomalies [14–17]. Indeed, the $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})^3$

duality transformations induce chiral $U(1)$ rotations on the massless fermions. The associated current has to be anomaly-free in order to preserve the duality symmetries. The anomaly may be cancelled in two possible ways: either through a sort of Green–Schwarz mechanism [18] or through contributions coming from the superheavy string spectrum. In some particular cases only the first mechanism is available and the particular universal (gauge group independent) structure of the Green–Schwarz mechanism forces the massless fermion content of the theory to be remarkably constrained. This would have very limited applications if it were only true for the few existing Abelian (2,2) orbifolds. In fact we emphasize that it also applies to the millions of possible (0,2) Abelian orbifolds one can construct with or without Wilson lines. This we have explicitely checked in a large number of such (0,2) models. We present a general study of such constraints in Abelian orbifolds. As an example of the power of the duality anomaly cancellation conditions we are able to show that one cannot possibly build a $\mathbf{Z}_3$ or $\mathbf{Z}_7$ 4-D string whose massless charged sector with respect to $SU(3)\times SU(2)\times U(1)$ is that of the minimal supersymmetric standard model. We also discuss constraints from the cancellation of mixed duality-gravitational anomalies.

The mixed duality-gauge anomaly is related through supersymmetry to one-loop moduli-dependent corrections [19,6] to the gauge coupling constants of the effective field theory. In many models the one-loop threshold effects, coming from massive string modes, provide an additional moduli dependence to the running of the gauge coupling constants. In section four we study the possible role of these threshold effects in rendering values for $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3 consistent with the experimental results. Indeed, if we restrict ourselves to the minimal particle content of the supersymmetric standard model, we find that there is no possible (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifold apart from $\mathbf{Z}_6$, $\mathbf{Z}'_8$ yielding the correct values for those quantities unless, the gauge groups are realized at higher Kac–Moody level. On the other hand, agreement can be obtained in $\mathbf{Z}_N\times\mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifolds (even with lowest Kac–Moody levels). This is a generalization of the analysis of ref.[20] to include the three orbifold complex planes and making use of the general classification of modular weights presented in section two. For completeness we also discuss the case in which one modifies the minimal particle content of the standard model to include extra massless multiplets.

In section five we discuss some constraints on SUSY-breaking soft terms from duality-invariant actions. We do not in fact rely on any specific assumption about how

supersymmetry is broken but simply assume that the auxiliary fields of the marginal deformation fields (the dilaton S and the three complex untwisted moduli T_i) are non-vanishing and provide the seed for SUSY-breaking. This is indeed what happens in all supersymmetry-breaking scenarios discussed up to now. If this is the case one can write down certain constraints amongst the physical gaugino masses depending on the modular weights of the massless fields. Similar though more model-dependent expressions may be found for the soft SUSY-breaking scalar masses. One important point is the lack of universality of these soft terms, unlike the usual assumptions made in the standard minimal low-energy supersymmetry models. Some final comments and conclusions are left for the sixth section.

2. Duality-Invariant Effective Field Theory

2.1. General supersymmetric 4-D string compactications

Let us define the basic string degrees of freedom which appear in the low-energy effective $N = 1$ supergravity action [21] of four-dimensional strings and which are needed for our discussion. In the following we will consider compactifications of the ten-dimensional heterotic string [22] on a six-dimensional (smooth) Calabi–Yau space [23] or on a six-dimensional orbifold. (We will in general *not assume* that we deal with (2,2) compactifications.) First, there are moduli fields which describe the allowed deformations of a given background. In the context of the underlying conformal field theory the moduli are the coupling constants related to the truly marginal operators which can be added to the two-dimensional world-sheet action without destroying the conformal invariance of the theory. These moduli parameters correspond in the effective low-energy theory to chiral matter fields $M_i(x)$ (we will denote both the chiral superfields and their scalar components by the same symbols) with completely flat potential, i.e. with undetermined vacuum expectation values ($vev's$) (at least if one disregards possible non-perturbative (infinite genus) string effects). The moduli take their values in the so-called moduli space $\mathcal{M}$, $M_i \in \mathcal{M}$, whose metric is determined by the two-point function of the associated marginal operators. Locally, the moduli space is a smooth Kähler manifold. However it is very important to realize that there may exist discrete reparametrizations of the form

$$M_i \to \widetilde{M}_i(M_i) \tag{2.1}$$

which change the geometry of the internal space but leave the massive string spectrum and the underlying conformal field theory invariant. These are the famous target space duality transformations [24,2,25,26] which form the discrete duality group Γ. The duality invariance is an entirely stringy phenomenon and is not present in the field theory compactifications. The most prominent example is the $R \to 1/R$ duality symmetry [24] for closed string compactification on a circle originating from the existence of topologically stable winding states. The target space duality invariance implies that certain points in $\mathcal{M}$ have to be identified, which means that the moduli space of the conformal field theory is a Kähler orbifold and not a smooth Kähler manifold: $\mathcal{M}_{\rm CFT} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{field theory}}/\Gamma$.

In addition to the moduli fields there are in general chiral matter fields $A_\alpha(x)$ with non-flat potential such that $\langle A_\alpha \rangle = 0$. Furthermore there are $N = 1$ vector supermultiplets with gauge bosons corresponding to a gauge group $G = \prod G_a$. In general, both the matter fields A_m as well as the moduli fields M_i are gauge non-singlets and build representations $\sum \underline{R}_a^\alpha$, $\sum \underline{R}_a^i$ respectively. It follows that at least some part of the gauge group is generically spontaneously broken by the moduli $vev's$. Only at special points in the moduli space the unbroken part of the gauge group gets enhanced. (Very often these points are given by orbifold points of $\mathcal{M}$.) Finally there is the gravitational supermultiplet together with the chiral dilaton–axion field commonly denoted by S. This field can be equivalently described by a linear supermultiplet.

Let us now describe the string tree-level low-energy action involving the moduli fields. Since all S-matrix elements computed in the underlying conformal field theory are invariant under the discrete target space duality transformations, it follows that also the corresponding effective action of the moduli fields must be duality invariant. (For recent summaries on these issues see refs.[27–29].) The kinetic energy of the moduli is given by a 4-dimensional supersymmetric non linear σ-model with the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ as target space and is therefore determined by the Kähler potential $K(M_i, \overline{M}_i)$ leading to the Kähler metric $K_{ij}(M_i, \overline{M}_i) = \partial K/\partial M_i \partial \overline{M}_j$: $\mathcal{L}_{\rm kin} = K_{ij} \partial_\mu M_i \partial^\mu \overline{M}_j$. Under the discrete target space duality transformations, being just discrete symmetries of $\mathcal{M}$, the Kähler metric transforms as

$$K_{ij}(M_i, \overline{M}_i) \to f_{ik}(M_i)^{-1} \overline{f}_{jl}(\overline{M}_i)^{-1} K_{kl}(M_i, \overline{M}_i) \tag{2.2}$$

where the holomorphic Jacobian is given as $f_{ik}(M_i) = \frac{\partial \widetilde{M}_i}{\partial M_k}$. On the other hand, the Kähler potential is in general not invariant under the discrete duality transformations. They will act as (U(1)) Kähler transformations on K, i.e.

$$K(M_i, \overline{M}_i) \to K(M_i, \overline{M}_i) + g(M_i) + \overline{g}(\overline{M}_i), \tag{2.3}$$

where $g(M_i)$ is a holomorphic function of the moduli fields.

The kinetic energy of the matter fields is in general a moduli dependent function. Expanding around the classical vacuum $\langle A_\alpha \rangle = 0$, the Kähler potential for the matter fields in lowest order in A_α looks like:

$$K^{\text{matter}} = K^{\text{matter}}_{\alpha\beta}(M_i, \overline{M}_i) A_\alpha \overline{A}_\beta + \dots \tag{2.4}$$

The discrete reparametrizations (2.1) in general induce a change of the matter Kähler potential $K_{\alpha\beta}(M_i, \overline{M}_i)$ of the form

$$K_{\alpha\beta} \to h_{\alpha\gamma}(M_i)^{-1} h_{\beta\delta}(\overline{M}_i)^{-1} K_{\gamma\delta}. \tag{2.5}$$

It follows that also the matter fields possess a non-trivial transformation behaviour under Γ transformations in order to obtain duality-invariant kinetic energy terms for the matter fields:

$$A_\alpha \to h_{\alpha\beta}(M_i) A_\beta. \tag{2.6}$$

Some of the moduli are related to the geometrical and topological data of the six-dimensional complex space. Specifically, these moduli fields split into two classes: first there are the moduli T_i $(i = 1, \dots, h_{(1,1)})$, which are associated with the deformations of the Kähler class. Second, we deal with deformations of the complex structure of the compact space parametrized by moduli U_m, $(m = 1, \dots, h_{(2,1)})$. ($h_{(1,1)}$ and $h_{(2,1)}$ are the non-trivial Hodge numbers of the compact space.) The moduli space factorizes into two distinct subspaces: $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_T \otimes \mathcal{M}_U$. Thus the moduli Kähler potential splits into the sum $K = K(T_i, \overline{T}_i) + K(U_m, \overline{U}_m)$. It follows that the change of the Kähler potential under duality transformations is given by two different holomorphic functions $g(T_i)$ and $g(U_m)$. There is however an important difference between the discrete reparametrizations of the T and U fields. Specifically, the discrete transformations acting on the complex structure moduli U_i do not change at all the geometry of the

underlying compact space; these invariances are of a field-theoretical nature. On the other hand, the moduli fields T_i are related with the size of the internal compact space. The existence of possible discrete reparametrization invariances in the T–field sector is an entirely stringy phenomenon and can be viewed as the generalization of the $R \to 1/R$ duality symmetry. Thus the stringy duality group is given by Γ_T and $\mathcal{M}_{\rm CFT} = \mathcal{M}_{\rm field\ theory}/\Gamma_T$. Considering only the overall modulus T whose real part determines the overall size of the compact space, the Kähler potential for T becomes in the large radius limit [30]

$$K = -3\log(T + \overline{T}). \tag{2.7}$$

However, for small values of the T–fields, formula (2.7) gets in general corrected by world-sheet instanton effects. These corrections determine the explicit form of the duality group Γ_T.

Considering the particular case of (2,2) compactifications, the matter fields are in a one-to-one correspondence with the moduli. Specifically, there exist $h_{(1,1)}$ matter fields A_i in the $\underline{27}$ representation and $h_{(2,1)}$ matter fields A_m in the $\overline{\underline{27}}$ representation of E_6. (Note that some of these "matter" fields may actually have a completely flat potential such that they are also (Wilson) line moduli whose non-zero $vev's$ break the gauge group E_6 and destroy the (2,2) superconformal symmetry, see the discussion in section 3.6.) For the compactifications on a smooth Calabi–Yau space, the Kähler metric of these matter fields is related to the moduli metric in a special way [31]:

$$\begin{aligned} K_{ij}^{\rm matter} &= e^{-(K(T_i)-K(U_m))/3} K_{ij}(T_i, \overline{T}_i), \\ K_{mn}^{\rm matter} &= e^{-(K(U_m)-K(T_i))/3} K_{mn}(U_m, \overline{U}_m). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

It follows that the matter metrics transform under target space duality transformations with a combined reparametrization and Kähler transformation, i.e.

$$\Gamma_T : \quad K_{ij}^{\rm matter} \to |e^{-g(T_i)/3}|^2 f_{ik}(T_i)^{-1} \overline{f}_{jl}(\overline{T}_i)^{-1} K_{kl}^{\rm matter} \tag{2.9}$$

and likewise for $K_{mn}^{\rm matter}$. The transformation eq.(2.9) implies that the matter fields transform like

$$\Gamma_T : \quad A_i \to e^{g(T_i)/3} f_{ij}(T_i) A_j. \tag{2.10}$$

Also note that in the large radius limit both types of matter metrics in eq.(2.8) display a particularly simple, universal dependence on the overall T–field:

$$K^{\rm matter} \sim \frac{1}{T+\overline{T}}. \tag{2.11}$$

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.2.2"¿2.2.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ (0,2) Abelian orbifolds

In the following we will discuss symmetric $\mathbf{Z}_M$ and $\mathbf{Z}_M \times \mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds. This discussion will be in a certain sense also more general than the above Calabi–Yau considerations since, it will not be restricted to the case of (2,2) orbifolds. All our formulas will be valid also for (0,2) models with non-standard gauge embeddings and/or with the presence of Wilson lines. These compactifications include some examples that are of phenomenological interest since the gauge group can be different from $E_6 \times E_8$. In fact, there exist models with standard model gauge group $G = SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ and three generations plus additional vector-like matter fields [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.32"¿32(2.8)html:¡/A¿–(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.34"¿34(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. Every orbifold of this type has three complex planes, and each orbifold twist $\vec{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$ acts either simultaneously on two or all three planes. In the following we will consider the dependence of the effective action on the untwisted moduli fields. The twisted moduli fields, whose non-trivial $vev's$ blow up the orbifold singularities leading to a smooth Calabi–Yau space, will be treated as matter fields. Furthermore, the twisted moduli are generically only present for the unique (2,2) embedding of each orbifold. The untwisted moduli split into T and U fields. All orbifolds have $h_{(1,1)} = 3, 5$ or 9 respectively, where the three generic T_i–fields ($i = 1, 2, 3$) describe the size of the three complex planes. The possible additional fields correspond to the relative shape of the three planes. On the other hand, the number of U-fields, with $h_{(2,1)} = 0, 1$ or 3, depends on whether the orbifold twists are compatible with the freedom of varying the complex structure of the three subtori. Specifically, there are six different cases of untwisted orbifold moduli spaces [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.35"¿35(2.8)html:¡/A¿]:

$$(1) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 3,\ \ h_{(2,1)} = 0,1,3: \ \ \mathcal{M} = \left[\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\right]^3_T \otimes \left[\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\right]^{h_{(2,1)}}_U . \tag{2.12}$$

$$(2) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 5,\ h_{(2,1)} = 0, 1 : \qquad \mathcal{M} = \left[\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \otimes \frac{SU(2,2)}{SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)}\right]_T \otimes \left[\frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)}\right]_U^{h_{(2,1)}}. \tag{2.13}$$

$$(3) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 9,\ \ h_{(2,1)} = 0 : \ \ \mathcal{M} = \left[\frac{SU(3,3)}{SU(3) \times SU(3) \times U(1)}\right]_T. \tag{2.14}$$

The corresponding Kähler potentials are given by

$$(1) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 3,\ \ h_{(2,1)} = 0, 1, 3 : \ \ K = -\sum_{i=1}^{3} \log(T_i + \overline{T}_i) - \sum_{m=1}^{h_{(2,1)}} \log(U_m + \overline{U}_m). \tag{2.15}$$

$$(2) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 5,\ h_{(2,2)} = 0, 1 : \qquad K = -\log(T_1 + \overline{T}_1) - \log\det(T_{ij} + \overline{T}_{ij}) - \sum_{m=1}^{h_{(2,1)}} \log(U_m + \overline{U}_m). \tag{2.16}$$

$$(3) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 9,\ \ h_{(2,1)} = 0 : \ \ K = -\log\det(T_{ij} + \overline{T}_{ij}). \tag{2.17}$$

(In order to keep contact with the previous notation we define $T_i = T_{ii}$ ($i = 2, 3$ for case (2) and $i = 1, 2, 3$ for case (3).) For the overall modulus field, which is obtained by identifying the three generic T–fields, i.e. $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$, and setting $T_{ij} = 0$ ($i \neq j$), the above formulae exactly reproduce $K = -3\log(T + \overline{T})$ (cf. eq.(2.7)). The correspondence with the Abelian orbifolds is the following

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \qquad & h_{(1,1)} = 3,\ h_{(2,1)} = 3 : \ \ \mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2 \\
& \qquad\qquad\quad h_{(2,1)} = 1 : \ \ \mathbf{Z}_6, \mathbf{Z}_8, \mathbf{Z}_4 \times \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Z}_6 \times \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Z}_{12} \\
& \qquad\qquad\quad h_{(2,1)} = 0 : \ \ \mathbf{Z}_7, \mathbf{Z}_8', \mathbf{Z}_{12}', \mathbf{Z}_6' \times \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_3, \\
& \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \mathbf{Z}_6 \times \mathbf{Z}_3, \mathbf{Z}_4 \times \mathbf{Z}_4, \mathbf{Z}_6 \times \mathbf{Z}_6 \\
(2) \qquad & h_{(1,1)} = 5,\ h_{(2,1)} = 1 : \ \ \mathbf{Z}_4 \\
& \qquad\qquad\quad h_{(2,1)} = 0 : \ \ \mathbf{Z}_6' \\
(3) \qquad & h_{(1,1)} = 9,\ h_{(2,1)} = 0 : \ \ \mathbf{Z}_3
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

The corresponding [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.13"¿13(2.8)html:¡/A¿] twist vectors $\vec{\theta}$, which define each of the above $\mathbf{Z}_N$ or $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifold, are shown in the the second column of table 1. Note that a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for the

presence of the complex structure modulus U_m is that the corresponding $m^{\rm th}$ complex plane is left unrotated by at least one of the orbifold twists. An analogous statement is also true for the T–fields: for case (2) ((3)), the two (three) complex planes which are associated with the four (nine) moduli fields T_{ij} are rotated by all of the orbifold twists. Notice that the above classification of orbifold moduli also applies to the $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifolds in the presence of discrete torsion described in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.13"¿13(2.8)html:¡/A¿].

The target space duality groups corresponding to the above six different cases have the following form (up to possible permutation symmetries):

$$(1) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 3, \;\; h_{(2,1)} = 0,1,3: \;\; \Gamma = [SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]_T^3 \times [SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]_U^{h_{(2,1)}}. \tag{2.19}$$

$$(2) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 5, \;\; h_{(2,1)} = 0,1: \;\; \Gamma = [SU(2,2,\mathbf{Z}) \times SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]_T \times [SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]_U^{h_{(2,1)}}. \tag{2.20}$$

$$(3) \qquad h_{(1,1)} = 9, \;\; h_{(2,1)} = 0: \;\; \Gamma = SU(3,3,\mathbf{Z}). \tag{2.21}$$

Considering only the three generic 'diagonal' fields T_i with Kähler potential as shown in eq.(2.15), the target space duality group (up to permutations) is simply given by the product of three modular groups, $\Gamma_T = [SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]^3$, acting on the three moduli as

$$T_i \to \frac{a_i T_i - i b_i}{i c_i T_i + d_i}, \tag{2.22}$$

with $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $a_i d_i - b_i c_i = 1$.

The Kähler potential of the matter fields A_α (which include, as already mentioned, also possibly existing twisted moduli) has a particularly simple dependence on the three generic moduli T_i [⋆] and on the three model-dependent fields U_m:

$$K^{\rm matter} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} \prod_{i=1}^{3} (T_i + \overline{T}_i)^{n_\alpha^i} \prod_{m=1}^{h_{(2,1)}} (U_m + \overline{U}_m)^{l_\alpha^m} A_\alpha \overline{A}_\beta \tag{2.23}$$

Thus each matter field A_α is characterized by $3 + h_{(2,1)}$ rational numbers which we will collect for convenience into two vectors $\vec{n}_\alpha = (n_\alpha^1, n_\alpha^2, n_\alpha^3)$ and $\vec{l}_\alpha = l_\alpha^m$

⋆ We omit to discuss the dependence on the off-diagonal moduli since these fields will not enter the threshold contributions discussed in the next sections. Alternatively, we can regard the fields T_{ij} $(i \neq j)$ also as matter fields since the Kähler potentials (2.16) and (2.17) expanded to lowest order in these fields have the form of eq.(2.24).

$(m = 1, \ldots, h_{(2,1)})$. Invariance of the matter kinetic energies under the target space modular group $\Gamma = [SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]^3_T \times [SL(2,\mathbf{Z})]^{h_{(2,1)}}_U$ requires the following transformation behaviour of the matter fields (up to constant matrices):

$$A_\alpha \to A_\alpha \prod_{i=1}^{3} (ic_i T_i + d_i)^{n^i_\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^{h_{(2,1)}} (ic_m U_m + d_m)^{l^m_\alpha}. \tag{2.24}$$

Therefore, in the following, we will call the numbers n^i_α and l^m_α the *modular weights* of the matter fields. Comparing with the formulae for smooth (2,2) Calabi–Yau spaces we recognize that the orbifold Kähler potential eq.(2.23) is in general different from eqs.(2.8),(2.11) using the moduli Kähler potential eq.(2.15). However for the special case $\vec{n}_\alpha = -\vec{e}_i$ ($\vec{e}_i$ are the three unit vectors) the orbifold matter kinetic energy reproduces the large radius limit of Calabi–Yau spaces eq.(2.11) upon identification of the three T–fields, i.e. $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$. As we will discuss now, this situation is exactly true for the untwisted matter fields.

Let us now discuss what the modular weight vectors $\vec{n}_\alpha$ and $\vec{l}_\alpha$ are in the case of Abelian orbifolds. One can immediately derive those from eq.(2.23) and the knowledge of the corresponding metrics of the matter fields (the pure gauge and gravitational fields are modular invariant). The metric of untwisted and twisted matter fields were computed (to first order in the matter fields) in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.31"¿31(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. For the untwisted matter fields associated to the j^{th} complex plane, $A^{\text{untw}} = A_j$, one finds

$$n^i_j = -\delta^i_j, \qquad l^i_j = -\delta^i_j. \tag{2.25}$$

States in the twisted sectors are created by the twist fields $\sigma_{\vec{\theta}}(\overline{z}, z)$ which are associated with an order N twist vector $\vec{\theta} = (\theta^1, \theta^2, \theta^3)$ ($0 \le \theta^i < 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^3 \theta^i = 1$) acting non-trivially on two or all three complex planes. The knowledge of the metric of these fields gives the result for the modular weights

$$\begin{aligned} n^i_\alpha &= -(1 - \theta^i), \qquad l^i_\alpha = -(1 - \theta^i), \qquad \theta^i \neq 0 \\ n^i_\alpha &= l^i_\alpha = 0, \qquad \theta^i = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

In the twisted sector of the theory, there are also massless states, which correspond to oscillators acting on the twisted vacuum. This is the case of the twisted moduli

in (2,2) orbifolds, but there are also plenty of other twisted oscillator states both in (2,2) and (0,2) models without that geometric interpretation. The associated vertices contain excited twisted fields $\tau_{\theta_i}(\overline{z},z)$ obtained upon operator product expansions of ground state twist operators with

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_z X^i &= \sum_{m\in\mathbf{Z}} \alpha^i_{m+\theta_i}\ z^{-m-1-\theta_i} \\ \partial_z \overline{X}^i &= \sum_{m\in\mathbf{Z}} \widetilde{\alpha}^i_{m-\theta_i}\ z^{-m-1+\theta_i}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

A generic twisted oscillator state will then look like

$$\prod_i^3 \prod_j^3 \prod_{m_i} \prod_{n_j} (\alpha^i_{m_i+\theta_i})^{p^i_m}\ (\widetilde{\alpha}^j_{n_j-\theta_j})^{q^j_n}\ |\sigma> \bigotimes |\vec{P}+\vec{\delta}> \tag{2.28}$$

where $\vec{\delta}$ is the shift vector which describes the embedding of the twist into the $E_8\times E_8$ lattice. In ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.31"¿31(2.8)html:¡/A¿] the metric for a particular type of oscillator states (the twisted moduli associated to the reparation of the orbifold singularities in (2,2) models) was computed. Examining those results and using symmetry arguments, one sees that an oscillator α^i changes the modular weight in the i^{th} direction of the twisted ground state by -1. (An explicit check of this is given in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.36"¿36(2.8)html:¡/A¿].) This is the case irrespective of the order m of the oscillator. Due to the commutation relationships $[\widetilde{\alpha}^i_{m+\theta_i}, \alpha^j_{n-\theta_j}] = \delta_{ij}\delta_{m,-n}(m+\theta_i)$ one concludes that the $\widetilde{\alpha}$ oscillators contribute to the modular weight with the opposite sign. The modular weights of oscillator states thus are

$$\begin{aligned} &n^i_\alpha = -(1-\theta^i+p^i-q^i), \qquad l^i_\alpha = -(1-\theta^i+q^i-p^i), \qquad \theta^i\neq 0 \\ &n^i_\alpha = l^i_\alpha = 0, \qquad \theta^i = 0\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

where $p^i=\sum_m p^i_m, q^i=\sum_n q^i_n$ count the number of oscillators of each chirality.

Sometimes one is specially interested in the dependence on the overall modulus $T=T_1=T_2=T_3$. The overall modular weights of matter fields with respect to this diagonal $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})$ modular group take particularly simple forms. It is just given by $n=\sum_{i=1}^3 n^i$ and from the previous equations one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} n &= -1 \qquad \text{(untwisted)} \\ n &= -2 - p + q \qquad \text{(twisted states with all planes rotated)} \\ n &= -1 - p + q \qquad \text{(twisted states with only two planes rotated)}\end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

where $p = \sum_i p^i, q = \sum_i q^i$.

An important question is what the possible modular weights of the massless particles are. From the above discussion, it is clear that this depends on the number of oscillators present in our state. Important constraints on the maximal possible oscillator number can be obtained from the mass formula for the (left-moving) twisted states:

$$\frac{M_L^2}{8} = N_{\rm osc} + h_{KM} + E_0 - 1. \tag{2.31}$$

Here $N_{\rm osc}$ is the fractional oscillator number and E_0 is the ground state energy of the twist field $\sigma_{\vec{\theta}}$ given as

$$E_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{1}{2}|v^i|(1 - |v^i|), \tag{2.32}$$

where $\vec{v} = v_i$ is a slightly redefined $N^{\rm th}$ order twist vector with $0 \leq |v^i| < 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^{3} v^i = 0$. Finally h_{KM} is the contribution to the conformal dimension of the matter fields from the left-moving (gauge) $E_8 \times E_8$ part. In the case of level one non-Abelian gauge groups one can represent this sector in terms of a shifted lattice and one just has

$$h_{KM} = (\vec{P} \ + \ \vec{\delta})^2/2. \tag{2.33}$$

More generally one can construct Abelian orbifolds with higher Kac–Moody level algebras [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.37"¿37(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In the general case one can write down a general expression for h_{KM} in terms of the Casimirs and levels of the relevant gauge Kac–Moody algebras involved. For a primary field in the representation $\underline{R}$ of the gauge group G associated to a Kac–Moody algebra of level k, one has $h_{KM} = \frac{C(\underline{R})}{C(G)+k}$, where $C(\underline{R})$ ($C(G)$) is the quadratic Casimir of the $\underline{R}$ (adjoint) representation of G; $C(\underline{R})$ is related to $T(\underline{R})$ by $C(\underline{R}){\rm dim}(\underline{R}) = T(\underline{R}){\rm dim}G$ ($T(\underline{R})$ is the index of the representation $\underline{R}$). In general there will be a gauge group with several group factors G_a (as in the phenomenologically relevant case $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$) and each massless particle transforming like $(\underline{R}_1, \underline{R}_2, ...)$ will have the conformal dimension

$$h_{KM} \ = \ \sum_a \frac{C(\underline{R}_a)}{C(G_a) + k_a}. \tag{2.34}$$

Notice that the contribution of the KM sector to the conformal dimension decreases as the level increases. On the contrary it increases as the dimension of the representation increases, which causes the absence of massless particles with large dimensionality in string models [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.37"¿37(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.38"¿38(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In phenomenological applications, the conformal dimension of the standard model particles will be relevant. For convenience of the reader we show in table 2 the separate contribution of each group to the standard model particles KM conformal dimension. We also show the total contribution to h_{KM} for two choices of KM levels consistent with GUT-like gauge coupling boundary conditions at the string scale. They correspond to level one and level two non-Abelian gauge factors. Notice that in the presence of extra gauge interactions (such as e.g. extra $U(1)$'s) there would be additional contributions to h_{KM} and hence the results in the table give a *lower bound* to the KM conformal dimension of each standard model particle.

For a massless state with $M^2 = 0$ it now follows that the maximum oscillator number is constrained by

$$N_{\rm osc} \ \leq (1 \ - \ E_0 \ - h_{KM}). \tag{2.35}$$

Since for a given orbifold the value of E_0 is fixed, it is clear that the smaller h_{KM} is, the bigger $N_{\rm osc}$ will be and hence the range of allowed modular weights. In fact, in the KM level one case, the smallest possible contribution to h_{KM} is obtained in orbifolds for $\vec{P} = 0$ in which case $h_{KM} = (\vec{\delta})^2/2$. In any given Abelian orbifold one can check that the shortest (world-sheet) modular invariant shift possible has length $(\vec{\delta})^2 = (\vec{v})^2$. Thus irrespective of the gauge group one finds

$$N_{\rm osc} \ \leq \ (1 \ - \ \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \ |v_i|). \tag{2.36}$$

In a twisted sector of order N the largest possible (negative) value for the modular weight will be obtained when there are p oscillators with the lowest possible $1/N$ fractional modding. This number p of oscillators will thus be bounded by

$$p \ \leq \ N \ (1 \ - \ \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \ |v_i|). \tag{2.37}$$

From this equation one can obtain the maximum number $p_{\max}$ of oscillators α^i present in any possible twisted sector of Abelian orbifolds. This is shown in the second column of table 3. The maximum possible number $q_{\max}$ of $\widetilde{\alpha}^i$ oscillators is more constrained. Such oscillators only appear in complex planes i in which $\theta_i \geq 1/2$. Only in this case their contribution to the mass formula may allow for massless particles. The third column of table 3 shows $q_{\max}$ for the different twisted sectors. For the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold sectors no such type of oscillators are present in the massless sector. For the rest of the twists with three rotated planes, one $\widetilde{\alpha}$ oscillator may be present along one particular complex plane in each case. Each of these oscillators contribute to the mass formula $1-\theta_1$ which is always bigger than $1/N$. This is why only one such oscillator might be present for such type of twists. For twisted sectors with one unrotated plane (last four cases in the table), $\widetilde{\alpha}$ oscillators are generically present in one of the rotated planes. Of course the above arguments only guarantee that the relevant state can be massless, but this does not mean that it is present in the massless spectrum since it has also to survive the generalized GSO projection of the orbifold symmetries.

From the second and third columns of table 3 and eq.(2.29) one can obtain the allowed range for the modular weights in each of the three complex dimensions. In the case of the overall modulus T, using eq.(2.30), it is easy to find the allowed values of the modular weights. This is shown in the fourth column of table 3. The extreme values for n assume the minimum value for $h_{KM} = \sum_i |v_i|^2/2$ corresponding to level one non-Abelian factors. Notice that each particular $\mathbf{Z}_N$ or $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifold is constructed by joining in a (world-sheet) modular invariant way all the twists generated by the vectors in the first column of table 3. We thus observe that the modular weights with respect to the diagonal modulus vary in an absolute range $-9 \leq n \leq 4$ for Abelian $\mathbf{Z}_N$ and $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifolds.

If the value of the Kac–Moody conformal dimension of the relevant massless field is larger than the minimal value discussed above, the range of possible modular weights is substantially decreased. Consider in particular the phenomenologically interesting case of possible massless states describing the standard model fields. For the standard choice of the KM levels, $3/5k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1$, we know we have $h_{KM} = 3/5$ for Q, U, E-type states and $h_{KM} = 2/5$ for $L, D, H, \overline{H}$-type states (see table 2). Plugging those values in eq.(2.35), one obtains the much more restricted values for the diagonal modulus modular weights shown in columns 5 and 6 of table

3. We thus see that in Abelian orbifolds the range of overall modular weights is given by $-3 \leq n_{Q,U,E} \leq 0$ and $-5 \leq n_{L,D,H,\overline{H}} \leq 1$ (for $3/5k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1$). All these constraints on the modular weights will play an important role in the discussions in the following sections.

(2.8)html:¡A name="section.3"¿3.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Cancellation of Target Space Modular Anomalies

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.3.1"¿3.1.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ The σ-model and duality anomalies in general 4-D strings

In this section we will discuss some loop effects in four-dimensional string theories. As is well known, gauge and gravitational anomalies destroy the quantum consistency of "ordinary" field theories. The requirement of the absence of these anomalies puts severe constraints on the form of the massless fermionic spectrum of the theory. Considering four-dimensional string theories, gauge and gravitational anomalies must also be absent, leading to the same constraints on the massless particle spectrum as compared to field theory. They come as an automatic consequence of world-sheet modular invariance [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.39"¿39(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. An important exception of this statement is given by an anomalous $U(1)$ gauge group. In fact, the anomalous triangle diagram with external $U(1)$ gauge bosons can arise in string theory. The quantum consistency of the theory is still preserved since the $U(1)$ anomaly can be cancelled by the so-called Green–Schwarz mechanism [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.18"¿18(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This mechanism leads to a mixing [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.40"¿40(2.8)html:¡/A¿] between the $U(1)$ gauge boson and the axion (dilaton) field, such that the anomalous variation of the field theory triangle diagram is cancelled by a proper change of the dilaton field under $U(1)$ transformations.

Apart from these gauge anomalies, supersymmetric non-linear σ-models exhibit another type of anomalies, namely the so-called σ-model anomalies [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.41"¿41(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. These involve, similar to the local gauge anomalies, triangle diagrams where some of the external fields are given by composite σ-model connections, which do not correspond to dynamical, propagating degrees of

freedom. In the string case, the continuous σ-model symmetries are generically broken by explicit couplings among the massless fields, e.g. by the tree-level Yukawa couplings or by one-loop effects. This explicit breakdown originates from the influence of the heavy string spectrum, which is not invariant under continuous changes of the moduli. Therefore possible σ-model anomalies would not constrain the field theory spectrum further. However, in string theory, the massive spectrum, i.e. momentum together with 'winding' states, is invariant under the discrete duality transformations. In fact, the σ-model anomalies due to the massless fermions also induce a non-invariance of the corresponding one-loop effective action under target space duality transformations. These "stringy" duality anomalies must be cancelled since one knows that the duality symmetries are preserved in any order of string perturbation theory. This is in sharp contrast with normal field theory. As we will discuss in the following, for a broad class of string compactifications the requirement of the absence of the target space duality anomalies provides new constraints on the massless string spectrum which were not discussed before. In particular, we will show that for some orbifold compactifications the minimal supersymmetric standard model spectrum would lead to target space duality anomalies and has therefore to be discarded.

Specifically, consider the supersymmetric non-linear σ-model of the moduli M_i with target space $\mathcal{M}$ coupled to gauge and matter fields as described in the last section. At the one-loop level one encounters two types of triangle diagrams with two gauge bosons of the gauge group $G = \prod {G_a}^{\star}$ and several moduli fields as external legs and massless gauginos and charged (fermionic) matter fields circulating inside the loop: first the coupling of the moduli to the charged fields contains a part described by a composite Kähler connection, proportional to $K(M_i, \overline{M}_i)$, which couples to gauginos as well as to chiral matter fields $A_\alpha^{R_a}$. (We assume here that the moduli are gauge singlets.) It reflects the (tree-level) invariance of the theory under Kähler transformations. Second, there is a coupling between the moduli and the $A_\alpha^{R_a}$'s by the composite curvature (holonomy) connection. It originates from the non-canonical kinetic energy $K_{\alpha\beta}^{\rm matter}$, eq.(2.4), of the matter fields $A_\alpha^{R_a}$. These two anomalous contributions lead, together with the tree-level part which is given

$\star$ Analogously, there is also a mixed gravitational, σ-model anomaly with two gravitons and one composite Kähler/curvature connection as external legs (see section 3.5).

by the dilaton/axion field S, to the following (non-local) one-loop effective supersymmetric Lagrangian [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.15"¿15(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.16"¿16(2.8)html:¡/A¿]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl} = \sum_a \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} W^a W^a \Bigg\{ S - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\frac{1}{16}\Box^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}\Bigg(\Big[C(G_a) - \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)\Big] K(M_i,\overline{M}_i) + 2\sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a) \log\det K^{\rm matter}_{\alpha\beta}(M_i,\overline{M}_i)\Bigg)\Bigg\} + \text{h.c.} \tag{3.1}$$

Here W^a is the Yang–Mills superfield. Writing this expression in components it leads to a non-local contribution to the CP odd term $F_{\mu\nu}\widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}$ and to a local contribution to the gauge coupling constant. Now, it is easy to recognize that $\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl}$, eq.(3.1), is not invariant under Kähler transformation and reparametrizations which act non-trivially on $K(M_i,\overline{M}_i)$, $K^{\rm matter}_{\alpha\beta}$ respectively. These non-invariances correspond to the two types of σ-model anomalies, namely to the Kähler and curvature (holonomy) anomalies. It follows that $\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl}$ is not invariant under the discrete target space duality transformations (2.1) since these act exactly as combined Kähler transformations and reparametrizations. Using eqs.(2.3) and (2.5), the change of $\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl}$ under duality transformations is given by the local expression

$$\delta(\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl}) = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_a \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} W^a W^a \Bigg(\Big[C(G_a) - \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)\Big] g(M_i) + 2\sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a) \log\det h_{\alpha\beta}(M_i)^{-1}\Bigg) + \text{h.c.} \tag{3.2}$$

It follows that the duality anomalies must be cancelled by adding new terms to the effective action. Specifically, there are two ways of cancelling these anomalies. In the first one [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿],[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.16"¿16(2.8)html:¡/A¿] the S field may transform non-trivially under duality transformations and cancels in this way some part or all of the duality non-invariance of eq.(3.1). This non-trivial transformation behaviour of the S–field is completely analogous to the Green–Schwarz mechanism for the case of an anomalous $U(1)$ gauge group and leads to a mixing between the moduli and the S–field in the S–field Kähler potential. Note that the Green–Schwarz mechanism does not only

cancel the anomalies associated to the discrete duality transformations, but in fact all continuous σ-model anomalies.

Second, the duality anomaly can be cancelled by adding to eq.(3.1) a term, which is related to the gauge group dependent threshold contribution due to the massive string states. The threshold contributions are given in terms of automorphic functions of the target space duality group, which have the required transformation behaviour only under the discrete duality transformations but not under all continuous reparametrizations and Kähler transformations. The explicit breaking of the continuous σ-model symmetries by the one-loop threshold effects follows from the fact that the heavy mass spectrum is not invariant under continuous reparametrizations of the moduli, but only under the discrete duality transformations.

It is clear that the part of the σ-model anomaly which is removed by the Green–Schwarz mechanism is universal, i.e. gauge group independent. (Otherwise one would need for each gauge group factor an extra S–field which is not present in string theory.) Thus for cases where there are no moduli dependent threshold contributions from the massive states the σ-model anomaly coefficients have to coincide for each gauge group factor G_a. As we will discuss, this particularly interesting constraint arises for many orbifold compactifications where the moduli dependent threshold contributions are absent because of an enlarged $N = 4$ supersymmetry in the massive spectrum.

Before we come to the orbifolds, let us briefly evaluate the one-loop effective action eq.(3.1) for the case of (2,2) Calabi–Yau compactifications with gauge group $G = E_8 \times E_6$ and with $h_{(1,1)}$ matter fields in the $\underline{27}$ representation of E_6 and with $h_{(2,1)}$ matter fields in the $\overline{\underline{27}}$ representation. Using the special relation between the Kähler metrics of the moduli and matter fields as given in eq.(2.8) one derives [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.42"¿42(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.43"¿43(2.8)html:¡/A¿]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl} = \sum_a \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} W^a W^a \Bigg\{ S - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\frac{1}{16}\Box^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}\Bigg(\big[C(G_a) - \\
T(\underline{R})(\frac{5}{3}h_{(1,1)} + \frac{1}{3}h_{(2,1)})\big] K(T_i, \overline{T}_i) \\
+ \big[C(G_a) - T(\underline{R})(\frac{5}{3}h_{(2,1)} + \frac{1}{3}h_{(1,1)})\big] K(U_m, \overline{U}_m) \\
+ 2T(\underline{R})\big[\log\det K_{ij}(T_i, \overline{T}_i) + \log\det K_{mn}(U_m, \overline{U}_m)\big]\Bigg)\Bigg\} + \text{h.c.},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

with $a = E_6, E_8$ and $C(E_8) = 30$, $C(E_6) = 12$, $T(\underline{27}) = T(\overline{\underline{27}}) = 3$. Looking for example at the Kähler class moduli T_i one observes that one needs in principle two types of automorphic functions: the first one provides a duality invariant completion of $K(T_i, \overline{T}_i)$, where the second one is needed to cancel the duality anomaly coming from $\log\det K_{ij}(T_i, \overline{T}_i)$. These two types of automorphic functions can be, at least formally, constructed for all (2,2) Calabi–Yau compactifications [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.43"¿43(2.8)html:¡/A¿].

It is interesting to compute eq.(3.3) for the large radius limit of Calabi–Yau compactifications as a function of the overall T–field. With eq.(2.7) one obtains

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl} = \sum_a \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} W^a W^a \left\{ S - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\frac{1}{16}\Box^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D} b_a \log(T+\overline{T}) \right\} + \text{h.c.} \qquad (3.4)$$

We see that in the large radius limit the σ-model anomaly is simply determined by the $N = 1$ β-function coefficient $b_a = -3C(G_a) + (h_{(1,1)} + h_{(2,1)})T(\underline{R})$.

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.3.2"¿3.2.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Target space modular anomalies in Abelian orbifolds

Let us now return to the (2,2) and (0,2) orbifold compactifications. We will discuss the σ-model anomalies as a function of the diagonal moduli T_i $(= 1, 2, 3)$ and U_m $(m = 1, \ldots, h_{(2,1)})$. Recall that the Kähler metrics of the matter fields, eq.(2.23), are determined in terms of the modular weights n^i_α and l^m_α. The moduli Kähler potential is given in eq.(2.15). Then the tree-level Yang–Mills action, together with one-loop anomalous contribution of the massless gauginos and matter fermions, takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\rm nl} = \sum_a \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} W^a W^a \Bigg\{ & S - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\frac{1}{16}\Box^{-1}\overline{\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D} \\ & \left[\sum_{i=1}^{3} b'^i_{\ a} \log(T_i + \overline{T}_i) + \sum_{m=1}^{h_{(2,1)}} b'^m_{\ a} \log(U_m + \overline{U}_m) \right] \Bigg\} + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \qquad (3.5)$$

The anomaly coefficients $b'^i_{\ a}$ and $b'^m_{\ a}$ look like [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.15"¿15(2.8)html:¡/A¿],[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿]

$$\begin{aligned} b'^i_{\ a} &= -C(G_a) + \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)(1 + 2n^i_{\underline{R}_a}), \\ b'^m_{\ a} &= -C(G_a) + \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)(1 + 2l^m_{\underline{R}_a}). \end{aligned} \qquad (3.6)$$

Considering only the dependence on the overall modulus $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ the Yang–Mills Lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl} = \sum_a \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} W^a W^a \left\{ S - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{1}{16} \Box^{-1} \overline{\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{D} b'_a \log(T + \overline{T}) \right\} + \text{h.c.} \qquad (3.7)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} b'_a &= -3C(G_a) + \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)(3 + 2n_{\underline{R}_a}) \\ &= b_a + 2 \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)(1 + n_{\underline{R}_a}), \end{aligned} \qquad (3.8)$$

where n is the overall modular weight: $n = \sum_{i=1}^{3} n^i$. We recognize that the gauginos and matter fields with $n_{\underline{R}_a} = -1$ contribute to the anomaly coefficient b'_a in the same way as to the $N = 1$ β-function coefficient b_a. Since all untwisted matter fields have $n = -1$, the whole untwisted sector of orbifolds behaves like the large radius limit of Calabi–Yau compactifications (cf. eq.(3.4)). The deviation from this behaviour is caused by the twisted orbifold fields, whereas world-sheet instantons modify the large radius limit for the case of Calabi–Yau compactifications.

As already mentioned, the target space modular anomaly, i.e. the non-invariance of the gauge coupling constant eq.(3.5) under $T_i \to \frac{a_i T_i - i b_i}{i c_i T_i + d_i}$, can be cancelled in two different ways. First, the universal, gauge group independent part of the anomaly is removed by the Green–Schwarz mechanism, which induces the following modular transformation behaviour of the dilaton field [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿]:

$$S \to S - \frac{k_a}{8\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \delta^i_{GS} \log(i c_i T_i + d_i). \qquad (3.9)$$

For modular transformations on the U_m fields, an analogous transformation holds. Here the δ^i_{GS} is the gauge group independent "Green–Schwarz" coefficient which describes the one-loop mixing between the S–field and the modulus T_i.

Second, the target space modular anomaly can be alternatively cancelled by a local contribution to $\mathcal{L}_{\rm nl}$, which is related to the one-loop threshold contributions to the gauge coupling constants. This topic will be discussed in section 4. Let us here consider the interesting case provided by those orbifold compactifications for which

a modulus T_i does not appear in the threshold corrections. This exactly happens [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.6"¿6(2.8)html:¡/A¿] if *all* orbifold twists $\vec{\theta}$, which define a particular $\mathbf{Z}_M$ or $\mathbf{Z}_M \times \mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifold, act non-trivially on the corresponding $i^{\rm th}$ complex plane of the underlying six-torus, i.e. $\theta_i \neq 0$ for all $\vec{\theta}$. Then the contribution from the momentum and winding states with T_i dependent masses to the threshold corrections is absent, since this part of the massive spectrum is organized into $N = 4$ supermultiplets. Furthermore, the massive spectrum in the twisted sectors does not depend on the untwisted moduli. Thus in this case the target space modular anomaly associated to T_i has to be completely cancelled by the Green–Schwarz mechanism. This implies that $\delta^i_{GS} = {b'}^i_a/k_a$ for all gauge group factors G_a. Since δ^i_{GS} is gauge group independent, it immediately follows that the anomaly coefficients (3.6) must take the same values for all group factors of the gauge group $G = \prod_a G_a$:

$$\frac{{b'}^i_a}{k_a} = \frac{{b'}^i_b}{k_b} = \frac{{b'}^i_c}{k_c} = ... \tag{3.10}$$

This requirement of the complete cancellation of the σ-model anomalies by the Green–Schwarz mechanism will provide very strong conditions on the possible spectrum of gauge non-singlet states, specifically on the allowed representations $\underline{R}_a$ in connection with the possible modular weights $n^i_{\underline{R}_a}$ as we will discuss now in the following. In the next section we will return to the threshold effects and their implications on string unification scenarios.

Let us first give a list [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.13"¿13(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.6"¿6(2.8)html:¡/A¿] of those orbifold compactifications for which there is complete σ-model anomaly cancellation without additional threshold effects (see also the twist vectors $\vec{\theta}$ in the second column of table 1). First for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds, all three complex planes are rotated by all orbifold twists. Therefore there is complete modular anomaly cancellation with respect to T_1, T_2 and T_3, and the ${b'}^i_a$ coefficients have to coincide for all three planes $i = 1, 2, 3$. The $\mathbf{Z}_4$, $\mathbf{Z}'_6$, $\mathbf{Z}_8$, $\mathbf{Z}'_8$, $\mathbf{Z}_{12}$ and $\mathbf{Z}'_{12}$ orbifolds have two completely rotated planes, such that the ${b'}^i_a$ coefficients have to coincide for $i = 2, 3$. Finally, for the $\mathbf{Z}_6$ orbifold, the moduli T_1, T_2 and U_1 appear in the threshold corrections, and only the modular anomaly associated to T_3 is completely cancelled by the Green–Schwarz mechanism. On the other hand, for all $\mathbf{Z}_M \times \mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds each complex plane is left unrotated by at least one orbifold twist [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.13"¿13(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. Therefore one does

not find the complete modular anomaly cancellation for any of these compactifications. It is interesting to note that if there exists a complex structure modulus U_m ($h_{(2,1)} \neq 0$), the threshold corrections always depend on this modulus. Therefore the anomaly coefficients b'^m_a are never constrained by the requirement of complete modular anomaly cancellation. The reverse situation is true for possible complex planes with off-diagonal fields T_{ij}. These fields never appear in the threshold corrections, since the corresponding complex planes are always rotated by all orbifold twists.

It is instructive to check how the modular anomaly cancellation conditions for completely rotated planes are satisfied for already known orbifold constructions. This check involves the determination of the modular weights of the charged fields as described in section 2. For example it is easy to show that for the symmetric (2,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold with standard embedding of the twist into $E_8 \times E_8$, the anomaly coefficients agree for all gauge group factors: $b'^i_{E_8} = b'^i_{E_6} = b'^i_{SU(3)} = -30$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. The modular anomalies with respect to the gauge groups E_8 and E_6 of additional (2,2) orbifolds were considered in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In the appendix A we also discuss the case of the (2,2) $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold in some detail.

It is important to stress that the modular anomaly cancellation has to work not only for the few (2,2) cases but also for the numerous (0,2) constructions with non-standard embeddings and/or additional background fields such as discrete Wilson lines. In general, these orbifolds yield gauge groups different from $E_6 \times E_8$. As a non-trivial (0,2) example we explicitly discuss in the appendix B a $\mathbf{Z}_4$ orbifold with gauge group $G = E_6 \times SU(2)_1 \times U(1) \times E_7 \times SU(2)_2$ [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.44"¿44(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. As required from our general arguments on modular anomaly cancellation, we find for the anomaly coefficients of the second and third plane: $b'^i_{E_6} = b'^i_{SU(2)_1} = b'^i_{E_7} = b'^i_{SU(2)_2} = -6$, $i = 2, 3$. We also checked for (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifolds with discrete Wilson lines that the anomaly coefficients of all gauge group factors coincide for each of the three complex planes.

Instead of looking at already explicitly constructed orbifold compactifications we now want to demonstrate that the requirement of having no target space modular anomalies leads to very strong, and so far undiscussed, constraints on the possible spectrum of massless fields for orbifolds with completely rotated planes. Specifically, we want to investigate the important question whether an orbifold with the standard model gauge group $G = SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$, plus exactly the massless particle

content of the minimal supersymmetric standard model, can be free of target space modular anomalies and can thus describe a consistent compactification scheme. The massless spectrum of the hypothetical minimal orbifold is characterized by the modular weights n^i_α of the standard model chiral fields where $\alpha = Q_g, U_g, D_g, L_g, E_g, H, \overline{H}$ $(g = 1, 2, 3)$ in an obvious notation. Then the anomaly coefficients of the minimal model take the following form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
{b'}^i_3 &= 3 + \sum_{g=1}^{3} (2n^i_{Q_g} + n^i_{U_g} + n^i_{D_g}), \\
{b'}^i_2 &= 5 + \sum_{g=1}^{3} (3n^i_{Q_g} + n^i_{L_g}) + n^i_H + n^i_{\overline{H}}, \\
{b'}^i_1 &= 11 + \sum_{g=1}^{3} (\frac{1}{3} n^i_{Q_g} + \frac{8}{3} n^i_{U_g} + \frac{2}{3} n^i_{D_g} + n^i_{L_g} + 2n^i_{E_g}) + n^i_H + n^i_{\overline{H}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.11}
$$

The condition of vanishing target space modular anomalies of the minimal orbifold compactifications now reads ${b'}^i_3/k_3 = {b'}^i_2/k_2 = {b'}^i_1/k_1$, where i corresponds to those complex planes that are rotated by all orbifold twists. For the case of $U(1)_Y$, our normalization of the $U(1)$ charges used in ${b'}^i_1$ is chosen in such a way that $k_1 = 5/3$ corresponds to the standard grand unification value of the Kac–Moody level. The above anomaly cancellation condition turns into two independent equations, which the modular weights of the standard model fields have to satisfy. For our purposes, it will be convenient to define the following two linear combinations which have to vanish:

$$
{A'}^i = \frac{k_2}{k_1} {b'}^i_1 - {b'}^i_2 = 0, \qquad {B'}^i = {b'}^i_1 + {b'}^i_2 - \frac{k_1 + k_2}{k_3} {b'}^i_3 = 0. \tag{3.12}
$$

Whether these two equations have any solutions crucially depends on the distribution of the allowed modular weights of the standard model fields, which were classified in section 2. Of course, similar constraints may be obtained for other extended gauge groups and particle contents.

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.3.3"¿3.3.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ The case of general (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ *orbifolds.*

The strongest constraints arise for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifolds where eq.(3.12) must be satisfied with respect to all three complex planes, and where the choice of possible values for the modular weights is very limited. Indeed there exist [(2.8)html:¡A

href="#reference.32"¿32(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.34"¿34(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)htm
href="#reference.33"¿33(2.8)html:¡/A¿] several $\mathbf{Z}_3$ examples with standard model gauge group and three chiral families, but all of these possess in addition some extra (non-chiral) matter fields. Thus, can there exist anomaly free $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifolds with just the minimal particle content? In the previous section we gave an extensive description of how one determines the allowed modular weights for massless particles. Let us give the result for the standard model particles for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold case. The first possibility for allowed modular weights is given by $\vec{n}_\alpha = (-1,0,0),(0,-1,0),(0,0,-1)$. These three choices correspond to untwisted chiral fields. The twist vector $\vec{\theta}$ of the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold has the form $\vec{\theta} = (1/3,1/3,1/3)$ ($\vec{v} = (1/3,1/3,-2/3)$). The conformal dimensions as a function of the Kac–Moody levels are given in table 2 for the standard model particles. Then, using eq.(2.35), we obtain that for $k = 3/5k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1$ there are no oscillators allowed for the standard model particles. For $k = 2$ the fields Q_g and U_g still must not have any oscillator, whereas the other fields may possess one twisted oscillator. Finally, for $k = 3$ all fields except Q_g may possess one oscillator, and for $k > 3$ we obtain $p_{\max} = 1$ for all standard model particles.

Let us first investigate the most common case of level one Kac–Moody algebras, $k_1 = 5/3$, $k_2 = k_3 = 1$. Then, apart from the "untwisted" modular weights, the only additional "twisted" possibility for the standard model fields is to have $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(2/3,2/3,2/3)$. (The corresponding overall modular weight $n = -2$ is displayed in table 3.) Thus, in total, the range of allowed modular weights consists of four possibilities. With the help of a computer program one can now check whether the two equations (3.12), together with eq.(3.11), have any simultaneous solutions using the four different allowed values for the modular weight vectors of each of the standard model particles. In doing this we find that there are no solutions at all. It is interesting to note that also the single equation ${b'}_2^i - {b'}_3^i = 0$ cannot be satisfied using the allowed modular weights. In this way the uncertainty of the $U(1)$ normalization factor k_1 is eliminated. Thus we have obtained the striking result that for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold with level one gauge groups the target space modular anomalies cannot be cancelled by the standard model particles. In this way we have ruled out the minimal level one $\mathbf{Z}_3$ compactifications by general consistency arguments. The requirement of target space anomaly freedom forces us to introduce additional fields.

At higher levels the range of allowed modular weights is broader. Specifically, if there can be one twisted oscillator one obtains the following additional allowed modular weight vectors: $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(5/3, 2/3, 2/3), -(2/3, 5/3, 2/3), -(2/3, 2/3, 5/3)$. In this case we find that for $k \geq 2$ the anomaly cancellation condition eq.(3.12) can be satisfied in various ways. Therefore we cannot prove minimal $\mathbf{Z}_3$ models with higher level Kac–Moody algebras to be inconsistent. Orbifold models with gauge groups realized at a higher Kac–Moody level were constructed in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.37"¿37(2.8)html:¡/A¿] (an example is briefly discussed in section 3.6). It is however complicated to explicitly construct models with higher level standard model gauge group. In addition we will show in the next section on threshold corrections, that the minimal $\mathbf{Z}_3$ compactifications cannot meet the phenomenological requirement of proper coupling constant unification, and are therefore ruled out on physical grounds.

Let us investigate more what the spectrum of additional massless states has to look like in order to satisfy the anomaly matching conditions. General classes of (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold models with gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)^n \times G_{\rm hidden}$ and three quark lepton generations plus extra vector-like matter were constructed in refs.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.32"¿32(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.33"¿33(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This was done by adding two quantized Wilson lines on the four different basic embeddings of the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold. For example, in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.32"¿32(2.8)html:¡/A¿] a three generation model with gauge group $G = SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)^8 \times SO(10)_{\rm hidden}$ was constructed. It is straightforward to show that the conditions of modular anomaly cancellation are satisfied in this model. Specifically, the untwisted states with non-trivial $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times SO(10)$ quantum numbers are given by $3[(\underline{3}, \underline{2}, \underline{1}) + (\overline{\underline{3}}, \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + (\underline{1}, \underline{2}, \underline{1}) + (\underline{1}, \underline{1}, \underline{16})]$, whereas the twisted states are of the form $3[5(\overline{\underline{3}}, \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + 4(\underline{3}, \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + 12(\underline{1}, \underline{2}, \underline{1})]$. Then one obtains $b'_{SU(3)} = b'_{SU(2)} = b'_{SO(10)} = -18$.

More generally, it was shown that one can construct, just within the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold, of order 50000 such three generation models but only nine different classes are inequivalent [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.45"¿45(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. Furthermore, these nine classes divide into two types, according to the lepton and quark content of the untwisted sector. Five of the classes have in that sector three copies of particles with quantum numbers

$$(\underline{3}, \underline{2}) \; + \; 2(\underline{1}, \underline{1}) \tag{3.13}$$

whereas the other four models have three copies of fields transforming like

$$(\underline{3},\underline{2}) \;+\; (\overline{\underline{3}},\underline{1}) \;+\; (\underline{1},\underline{2}) \tag{3.14}$$

under $SU(3) \times SU(2)$. Models belonging two these two classes always had some specific properties. In particular, irrespective of the structure of the model and of which other gauge factors are present, the number of $SU(2)$ doublets exceeds by 12 the number of $SU(3)$ triplets. This meant in practice the impossibility of getting the minimal Higgs content since in the minimal model the number of $SU(2)$ doublets exceeds the number of $SU(3)$ triplets only in the number of Higgs pairs.

Duality anomaly cancellation arguments allow us to understand the origin of these peculiar properties of these three generation models. Consider modular invariance with respect to the overall modulus $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$. In the type of models of refs.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.32"¿32(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.34"¿34(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.33"¿33(2.8)html:¡/A¿], the twisted oscillator states are always $SU(3) \times SU(2)$ singlets and hence the possible modular weights of quarks, lepton-doublets and Higgses are $n = -1$ (untwisted) and $n = -2$ (twisted). Cancellation of modular anomalies requires

$$b'_2 \;-\; b'_3 \;=\; 9 \;-\; 6 \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\,(N_3^U \;-\; N_2^U) \;+\; \frac{1}{2}\,(N_3^T \;-\; N_2^T) \;=\; 0, \tag{3.15}$$

where N_3^T and N_3^U are the numbers of triplets in the twisted and untwisted sectors respectively (and equivalently for the doublets). In the models with untwisted content as in eq.(3.13) one has $N_3^U = 6$ and $N_2^U = 9$ whereas in the second type one has $N_3^U = 9$ and $N_2^U = 12$. Thus from eq.(3.15) one gets in both cases

$$N_2^T \;-\; N_3^T \;=\; 9,$$

and there are altogether $9 + 3 = 12$ more doublets than triplets in all models. This gives an understanding of this pattern previously found in a model-by-model basis. Similar arguments should be applicable to other $\mathbf{Z}_3$ three-generation models obtained through the addition of three Wilson lines instead of two (for examples see ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.46"¿46(2.8)html:¡/A¿]). The determination of the complete massless spectrum of these models is extremely painful and using duality anomaly cancellation arguments one can obtain immediately information about the twisted spectrum by simply knowing the untwisted sector (which is trivial to obtain) and using equations analogous to eq.(3.15).

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.3.4"¿3.4.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ $\mathbf{Z}_7$ *and other orbifolds*

Now let us discuss the $\mathbf{Z}_7$ compactifications [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.12"¿12(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(href="#reference.47"¿47(2.8)html:¡/A¿] which provide the second class of orbifolds with three completely rotated planes. Again we will find that the target space modular anomalies cannot be cancelled, assuming a minimal particle content together with the standard model gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$. The distribution of allowed modular weight vectors for the standard model fields is as follows. For untwisted fields there are again the three possibilities $\vec{n}_\alpha = (-1, 0, 0) + \text{perm}$. The $\mathbf{Z}_7$ twist vector is given as $\vec{\theta} = (1/7, 2/7, 4/7)$. Then, for states without oscillators, one obtains in the twisted sectors three different allowed modular weight vectors: $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(6/7, 5/7, 3/7) + \text{perm}$. For simplicity, we restrict the discussion from now on to the level one case $3/5k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1$. This implies (see table 3) that the fields Q_g, U_g, E_g are not allowed to have any twisted oscillator contribution. Thus, the range of allowed modular weights consists of the six above mentioned choices. On the other hand, looking at the first twisted sector, the fields $D_g, L_g, H, \overline{H}$ may maximally have two oscillators associated to the first complex plane or one oscillator in the direction of the second plane. For the remaining twisted sectors an analogous statement is true. Thus we obtain nine additional allowed modular weight vectors for these type of fields: $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(13/7, 5/7, 3/7), -(20/7, 5/7, 3/7), -(6/7, 12/7, 3/7) + \text{perm}$. With these 15 allowed choices for $D_g, L_g, H, \overline{H}$ and the 6 possibilities for Q_g, U_g, E_g eq.(3.12) has not a single solution. This again rules out any minimal $\mathbf{Z}_7$ compactification at the lowest Kac–Moody level. However, at higher level we expect to find a variety of consistent solutions.

Concerning the other (level one) cases, we have summarized our results about the cancellation of the modular anomalies in the third column of table 1. Unfortunately, the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds provide the only two classes of models where the minimal standard model spectrum can be ruled out on the basis of modular anomaly cancellation requirements alone. As already discussed, all other models have at least one complex plane which is left unrotated by one of the orbifolds twists. Then the anomaly cancellation condition eq.(3.12) cannot be applied with respect to this particular complex plane. The consequence of the corresponding loss of one, two, or even all three equations is that for the remaining conditions one always finds modular weights of the standard model particles which are allowed by the particular model

under investigation. Thus, in order to obtain further constraints on these orbifolds, additional "phenomenological" boundary conditions are needed. This subject will be discussed in section 4.

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.3.5"¿3.5.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ The mixed gravitational anomalies

The above discussion was mainly concerned with the presence of mixed Kähler (and curvature) gauge anomalies. There will also be in general mixed triangular anomalies involving two gravitons instead of two gauge bosons. The computation of those anomalies is exactly parallel to the gauge anomalies, the only difference being that now all massless fermions (including the gravitino and fermionic partners of the dilaton and moduli) will contribute. The analogous anomaly coefficient $b'_{\rm grav.}$ can be computed to be

$$b'^{i}_{\rm grav} \;=\; 21 \;+\; 1 \;+\; \delta^i_M \;-\; \dim G \;+\; \sum_\alpha (1 \;+\; 2n^i_\alpha), \tag{3.16}$$

where the sum runs over all the massless charged chiral fields. (The mixed gravitational anomalies were also considered by [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.48"¿48(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)htm
href="#reference.16"¿16(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.49"¿49(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. However in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.16"¿16(2.8)html:¡/A¿] the contribution of the gravitino is apparently missing.) The contribution of the gravitino to the anomaly is given by 21, the dilatino contributes 1 (since it has no modular weight) and δ^i_M represents the contribution of modulinos to the anomaly, which is model-dependent; dim G is the dimension of the complete gauge group. Notice that for a completely rotated orbifold plane one has

$$b'^{i}_{\rm grav} \;=\; 24\;\frac{b'^{i}_{\rm gauge}}{k} \tag{3.17}$$

for any gauge group (as an example we check eq.(3.17) for the (2,2) $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold in the appendix A and for a (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_4$ example in appendix B). This fact leads to further constraints on the massless fermionic spectrum, although the computation of $b'_{\rm grav}$

requires a complete knowledge of the massless spectrum including all singlets. In the case of the overall modulus T the anomaly coefficient is

$$b'_{\rm grav} \;=\; 66 \;+\; \delta_M \;-\; 3(\dim\, G) \;+\; \sum_{\alpha} (3 \;+\; 2n_\alpha). \tag{3.18}$$

It is perhaps interesting to remark that, since in four dimensions there are no pure gravitational anomalies, these mixed σ model gravitational anomalies are the only ones that are sensitive to singlet particles, they are our only control on the possible existence of a "hidden sector" in the theory. Consider for example the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds. One can get an idea of the size of the "hidden sector" of the theory by using eqs.(3.17),(3.18) which yield

$$\begin{aligned} 3(\dim\, G_{\rm hidden}) - \sum_{\alpha={\rm hidden}} (3+2n_\alpha) \;=\; \\ -24b'_{\rm gauge} + 66 + \delta_M - 3(\dim\, G_{\rm visible}) + \sum_{\alpha={\rm visible}} (3+2n_\alpha) \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $b'_{\rm gauge}$ corresponds to any of the gauge groups. One can also make use of the gravitational anomaly cancellation in order to check in an easy manner if the computed massless spectrum of a given (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ or $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold is correct. Consider for example the class of three-generation $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold models with gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)^n \times G_{\rm hidden}$ discussed above [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.32"¿32(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.34"¿34(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)htm href="#reference.33"¿33(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. The computation of the massless sector can be extremely cumbersome (especially in the case with three Wilson lines) and it is very easy to miss some singlet states. In these models one has (one can check $\delta_M = -9$ for $\mathbf{Z}_3$)

$$\sum_T N_T + 3\sum_{\rm osc} N_{\rm osc} \;=\; -24b'_{\rm gauge} + 57 - 3{\rm dim}\; G + \sum_U N_U \tag{3.20}$$

where U, T,osc denote untwisted, twisted and twisted oscillator states. The quantities in the right-hand side are very easy to compute and eq.(3.20) gives us a handle on the singlets of the model. Using this equation, we have checked that the spectrum of some models in the literature is incomplete. Thus, for example, one can immediately check that the massless spectrum of the three-generation $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)^{13}$ model of ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.46"¿46(2.8)html:¡/A¿] is missing 75 states in the twisted sector.

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.3.6"¿3.6.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ The effect of symmetry-breaking flat directions on the modular anomalies

All the above discussion applies directly to the case of (0,2) orbifold 4-D strings with gauge group of rank ≥ 16, i.e. standard Abelian orbifold models. However, there are string solutions with smaller rank which are continuously connected to the above models by giving non-vanishing *vev*'s to some marginal deformations. In the effective field theory, these marginal deformations correspond to fields C with completely flat potential such that $< C >$ is an arbitrary parameter of the theory. An example of that are the Calabi–Yau limits of the unique (up to discrete torsion) (2,2) version of each orbifold, which are obtained by giving *vev*'s to the twisted moduli of each model. However it is important to remark that for a given orbifold there is a unique (2,2) version but *many thousands* of consistent (0,2) embeddings for which the "repaired" Calabi–Yau limit does not exist. Still, these models, as remarked in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.50"¿50(2.8)html:¡/A¿] do also possess other marginal deformations not necessarily associated with the geometry of the orbifold. When giving *vev*'s to these marginal deformations one generically lowers the rank of the gauge group and some chiral fields A, B get massive through renormalizable Yukawa couplings corresponding to a superpotential of the form $W \sim CAB$. This possibility is in fact often used in model-building in order to reduce the number of massless fields, which tends to be quite large in generic 4-D strings.

An obvious question is whether the anomaly constraints described above apply also to these "deformed" lower-rank models. Of course, modular anomalies must also cancel for these models; the question is whether one can impose constraints, e.g. as in eqs.(3.10),(3.17) to the massless sector. The answer to that question depends on the type of flat direction considered. If the flat direction involves *vev*'s only for untwisted fields in completely rotated planes, the answer is immediately yes. These types of flat directions were discussed in refs.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.50"¿50(2.8)html:¡/A¿] and [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.51"¿51(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. A simple example is provided by the standard (2,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold. The gauge group is $E_6 \times SU(3) \times E_8$ and there are three copies of $(\underline{27}, \underline{3})$ in the untwisted sector and 27 copies of $(\underline{27}, \underline{1})$ in the twisted sector. One can easily check [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.50"¿50(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.51"¿51(2.8)html:¡/A¿] that there is a flat direction involving non-vanishing *vev*'s for three scalars inside one

of the $(\underline{27},\underline{3})$'s which breaks $E_6\times SU(3)\to SO(8)\times U(1)^2$. At the same time, some untwisted fields acquire a mass through trilinear Yukawas, and one is left with untwisted and twisted matter fields with $SO(8)$ quantum numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} U &: 3\ (\underline{8}_v\ +\ \underline{8}_s\ +\ \underline{8}_c\ +\ \underline{1}) \\ T &: 27\ (\underline{8}_v\ +\ \underline{8}_s\ +\ \underline{8}_c\ +\ \underline{1}\ +\ \underline{1}\ +\underline{1}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Consider now the modular anomalies with respect to the overall modulus T. We know that for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ orbifold case one has $b'_{E_6}=b'_{E_8}=b'_{SU(3)}=-90$. For the "deformed" model obtained after the flat direction is taken one finds

$$b'_{SO(8)}\ =\ -3\ C_{SO(8)}\ +\ 3(1+1+1)\ -\ 27(1+1+1)\ =\ -90, \tag{3.22}$$

i.e., the constraints of eqs.(3.10) and (3.17) still hold. This is in fact not surprising, since the massive spectrum in untwisted sectors corresponding to completely rotated complex planes have an $N=4$ structure. When the marginal deformation appears, the fields which get a mass form complete $N=4$ multiplets, which give vanishing contribution to b' such that the value of b' is not changed by $<C>\neq 0$. Thus for these types of flat directions the constraints in eqs.(3.10) and (3.17) still hold.

Sometimes, taking one of these flat directions gives rise to a new orbifold model with gauge groups realized at a higher Kac–Moody level [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.37"¿37(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In these cases the k factors in eq.(3.10) are important. A $\mathbf{Z}_3$ example of this type was constructed in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.37"¿37(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This is a model with gauge group $SU(3)^3\times SO(14)\times U(1)^3$ and untwisted and twisted matter fields transforming like

$$\begin{aligned} U &: 3[(\underline{3},\underline{3},\underline{3})+(\underline{1},\underline{1},\underline{1})\ +\ (\underline{1},\underline{14})+(\underline{1},\underline{64})] \\ T &: 27[(\overline{\underline{3}},\underline{1},\underline{1})+(\underline{1},\overline{\underline{3}},\underline{1})+(\underline{1},\underline{1},\overline{\underline{3}})]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

One can easily check that for the overall modulus one has $b'_{SU(3)}=b'_{SO(14)}=-9$. One can also check that there is an untwisted flat direction in which, giving vacuum expectation values to some appropriate components of the $(\underline{3},\underline{3},\underline{3})$ fields, one arrives at a model with gauge group $SU(3)\times SO(14)\times U(1)^3$ in which the $SU(3)$ algebra is realized at level $k=3$ whereas $SO(14)$ is still at level $k=1$. The new model particle content has untwisted and twisted matter fields transforming like

$$\begin{aligned} U &: 3[(\underline{10},\underline{1})+(\underline{1},\underline{1})\ +\ (\underline{1},\underline{14})+(\underline{1},\underline{64})] \\ T &: 81(\overline{\underline{3}},\underline{1}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where the 10-plet corresponds to a three-index completely symmetric $SU(3)$ representation. The reader can easily check that

$$b'_{SU(3)} \;=\; k_3\; b'_{SO(14)} \;=\; 3\; b'_{SO(14)} \;=\; -27, \tag{3.25}$$

verifying eq.(3.10). Thus along this type of flat directions, it is the ratio b'/k which remains invariant due to the $N = 4$ supersymmetry of the massive fields and not b' itself.

For other types of flat directions, namely for untwisted fields that do not belong to a completely rotated plane and for twisted fields, the fields getting a mass do not form in general complete $N = 4$ multiplets and do contribute to the b's. Therefore the anomaly cancellation conditions (3.10) and (3.17) will no longer hold if one computes the anomaly coefficients by taking into account only the contribution of the remaining massless fields. (Of course, including also the fields which get their mass by $< C > \neq 0$, the anomaly conditions are always satisfied.) However, in this case one can show [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.17"¿17(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.52"¿52(2.8)html:¡/A¿] that the contribution of the mass field C to the one-loop threshold corrections exactly cancels the target space anomalies.

(2.8)html:¡A name="section.4"¿4.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Gauge Coupling Unification and Threshold Effects

In the last section we have obtained very strong constraints on the massless spectrum of those two classes of orbifold compactifications, for which all three complex planes are rotated simultaneously by all orbifold twists. However, this situation is certainly not the generic case since most orbifolds have at least one complex plane on which a particular twist is not acting. On the other hand, for the orbifolds with unrotated planes very useful restrictions on the form of the massless spectrum, in particular on the possible modular weights, can be obtained from the requirement of the proper unification of the running gauge coupling constants. Again we will show that large classes of orbifolds are ruled out by this "phenomenological" requirement when one assumes the particle content of the minimal supersymmetric standard

model. In ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿] we already discussed the gauge coupling running in minimal orbifold compactifications. The analysis presented in this section should be viewed as the continuation and elaboration of our earlier work in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. We will comment on the specific relation between the present analysis and ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿] later in the text. Threshold corrections and gauge coupling unification within the flipped $SU(5)$ string model [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.53"¿53(2.8)html:¡/A¿] were considered in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.54"¿54(2

For orbifolds with unrotated complex planes, the threshold contributions to the gauge coupling constant due to the massive momentum and winding states are of the following form [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.6"¿6(2.8)html:¡/A¿]:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_a(T_i,U_m) = &-\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i=1}^{3}(b'^{i}_{a}-k_a\delta^i_{GS})\log|\eta(T_i)|^4 \\ &-\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{m=1}^{h_{(2,1)}}(b'^{m}_{a}-k_a\delta^m_{GS})\log|\eta(U_m)|^4,\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\eta(T)=e^{-\pi T/12}\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1-e^{2\pi nT})$ is the Dedekind function. Using the well-known modular transformation properties of the Dedekind function, it is easy to check that the threshold corrections, together with the non-trivial transformation property of the S–field, exactly cancel the anomalies under the discrete target space modular transformations.

In the following we will neglegt the U_m dependence of the threshold corrections. This limitation will not affect our main conclusions. In particular, one can check that in orbifolds with two completely rotated planes the contribution from the standard model fields to the anomaly coefficients of the T_i and U_m moduli agree. Thus the possible contribution of the U-fields can be absorbed by a simple redefinition of the T–fields. Using eq.(4.1) for the moduli-dependent threshold corrections, the one-loop running gauge coupling constants take the following form (up to a small field independent contribution):

$$\frac{1}{g_a^2(\mu)}=\frac{k_a}{g^2_{\rm string}}+\frac{b_a}{16\pi^2}\log\frac{M^2_{\rm string}}{\mu^2}-\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i=1}^{3}(b'^{i}_{a}-k_a\delta^i_{GS})\log[(T_i+\overline{T}_i)|\eta(T_i)|^4]. \tag{4.2}$$

Here $M_{\rm string}$ is the typical string scale, which is of the order of the Planck mass. Its precise value, using the $\overline{MS}$ scheme, is determined by the universal string coupling constant $g_{\rm string}$ as [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.19"¿19(2.8)html:¡/A¿] $M_{\rm string} = 0.7 \times g_{\rm string} \times 10^{18}$GeV. The unification mass scale M_X where two gauge group coupling constants become equal, i.e. $\frac{1}{k_a g_a^2(M_X)} = \frac{1}{k_b g_b^2(M_X)}$, becomes using eq.(4.2):

$$\frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = \prod_{i=1}^{3} [(T_i + \overline{T}_i)|\eta(T_i)|^4]^{\frac{b_b^{i\,\prime} k_a - b'^{i}_{\ a} k_b}{2(b_a k_b - b_b k_a)}}. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that since we are interested only in the difference of two gauge couplings, the universal Green–Schwarz term is irrelevant for M_X. It is clear that the unification scale M_X does not depend on those moduli T_i which correspond to a completely rotated complex plane, since in this case one has $b'^{i}_{\ a} k_b = b_b^{i\,\prime} k_a$ (cf. eq.(3.10)). Thus for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds it immediately follows that $M_X = M_{\rm string}$. For the remaining classes of models with at least one unrotated plane one generically obtains either $M_X < M_{\rm string}$ or $M_X > M_{\rm string}$. Which of the two possibilities is realized depends on the modular weights of the charged fields and also on the values of the T_i fields. In our previous paper [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿] we considered the threshold dependence on the overall modulus $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_2$. Identifying the three moduli in this way, one concludes that $M_X > M_{\rm string}$ if only charged states with overall modular weights $n = -1$ (e.g. as in the $\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ orbifold) contribute to b'. On the other hand, leaving the three fields T_i as independent parameters, $M_X < M_{\rm string}$ is in principle possible even in this case if, for example, $\vec{n}_\alpha = (-1, 0, 0)$ and $T_1 >> T_2, T_3$, such that the dominant contribution to the threshold effects comes from T_1.

As a useful illustration of the fact that both $M_X > M_{\rm string}$ and $M_X < M_{\rm string}$ can actually occur in known orbifold compactifications, we discuss in the appendix B a (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_4$ orbifold with gauge group $G = E_6 \times SU(2)_1 \times U(1) \times E_7 \times SU(2)_2$. As discussed in the previous section, this orbifold requires complete modular anomaly cancellation with respect to T_2 and T_3. Thus the threshold corrections entirely depend only on T_1. Specifically one finds the following unification scenario: The unification of E_6 with $SU(2)_2$ occurs at $M_X < M_{\rm string}$. (The precise value of M_X depends on the value of T_1.) Second, $M_X = M_{\rm string}$ for the unification of E_6 with $SU(2)_1$ and of E_7 with

$SU(2)_2$. Finally, E_6 and E_7 as well as $SU(2)_1$ and E_7 unify at $M_X > M_{\rm string}$, whereas the coupling constants of $SU(2)_1$ and $SU(2)_2$ do not meet at all ($b_{SU(2)_1} = b_{SU(2)_2}$).

Now we want to investigate the question whether the $\mathbf{Z}_N$ or $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifold compactifications can lead to the correct unification of the three coupling constants of the standard model gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$, taking into account the threshold correction of the massive string excitations. Our analysis will be based on the experimentally measured values of the strong coupling constant and the weak mixing angle: $\alpha_3^{\rm exp} = 0.115 \pm 0.007$, $\sin^2\theta_W^{\rm exp} = 0.233 \pm 0.0008$. Considering the effect of the spectrum of the minimal supersymmetric standard model on the one-loop renormalization group equations [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.55"¿55(2.8)html:¡/A¿] (without any threshold corrections) with a SUSY threshold close to the weak scale, one finds that the quoted results for α_3 and $\sin^2\theta_W$ are in very good agreement with a unification mass $M_X/M_{\rm string} \simeq 1/50$ [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.56"¿56(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿] we showed, looking only at the overall modulus T, that this substantial discrepancy of scales can be made consistent by the inclusion of the string threshold correction, provided the modular weights of the standard model particles satisfy certain, very constrained conditions. Now we will check in which classes of orbifolds the required conditions on the modular weights can be met taking into account also the constraints from the complete target space modular cancellation associated to completely rotated complex planes. We will also comment on the viability of some possible extensions of the minimal particle content.

Making use of eq.(4.3) one gets for the value of the electroweak angle θ_W and for the strong coupling constant α_3, after some standard algebra:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin^2\theta_W(\mu) &= \frac{k_2}{k_1+k_2} \\
&\quad - \frac{k_1}{k_1+k_2}\frac{\alpha_e(\mu)}{4\pi}\left(A\log(\frac{M_{\rm string}^2}{\mu^2}) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} A'^i \log[(T_i+\overline{T}_i)|\eta(T_i)|^4]\right), \\
\frac{1}{\alpha_3(\mu)} &= \frac{k_3}{(k_1+k_2)}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_e(\mu)}\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4\pi}B\log(\frac{M_{\rm string}^2}{\mu^2}) + \frac{1}{4\pi}\sum_{i=1}^{3} B'^i \log[(T_i+\overline{T}_i)|\eta(T_i)|^4]\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where $A = \frac{k_2}{k_1} b_1 - b_2$ and $B = b_1 + b_2 - \frac{(k_1+k_2)}{k_3} b_3$. A'^i and B'^i have the same expressions after replacing $b_a \to b'^i_a$ (see eq.(3.12)).

Let us first compute α_3^0 and $\sin^2\theta_W^0$, which we define to be the values of the strong coupling constant and the weak mixing angle, respectively, without any string threshold corrections, i.e. $A'^i, B'^i = 0$. From now on we restrict the discussion to the Kac–Moody level one case $k_3 = k_2 = 3/5k_1 = 1$. For the spectrum of the minimal supersymmetric standard model one has $A = 28/5$ and $B = 20$. Then the large value for the string unification mass leads to $\alpha_3^0 = 0.20$ and $\sin^2\theta_W^0 = 0.218$ [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.57"¿57(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿], in gross conflict with the experimental data. It is useful to consider also the effect of including extra, light (with mass at the weak scale) chiral fields in non-minimal compactifications. Specifically, we compute α_3^0 and $\sin^2\theta_W^0$, including various combinations of extra $SU(3)$ octets O and $SU(2)$ triplets T, being singlets under the other two gauge groups, plus possible extra non-exotic standard model particles. The results of these computations are displayed in table 4. None of the choices is in agreement with the experimentally required values for α_3 and $\sin^2\theta_W$. (Various other extensions of the minimal unification scenario can be tried out, but we found that none of them meets the experimental requirements.) For later use, it is convenient to introduce the following parameter γ^0, which indicates the deviation of the 'bare' string predictions from the experimentally correct values:

$$\gamma^0 = \frac{5}{3}\alpha_e \left(\frac{(1/\alpha_3^0) - (1/\alpha_3^{\rm exp})}{\sin^2\theta_W^0 - \sin^2\theta_W^{\rm exp}} \right). \tag{4.5}$$

The relevant values for γ^0 are again shown in table 4. (There, $\gamma^0 \sim 0$ means that α_3^0 is in good agreement with experiment, whereas $\sin^2\theta_W^0$ is several standard deviations away.)

Having convinced ourselves that the minimal string unification as well as various extensions with light particles fail to reproduce the experimentally known parameters without or with only tiny string threshold corrections, we can think of two kinds of alternatives (of course, the following two possibilities can also be realized simultaneously): First, some of the additional fields are not light but sit at some intermediate mass scale with or without intermediate unification of the standard model gauge groups. In fact it was shown in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A

href="#reference.57"¿57(2.8)html:¡/A¿] that this is a viable approach for case j of our table 4. Secondly, insisting on having only light fields, the effects of string threshold corrections accommodate for the correct values of α_3 and $\sin^2\theta_W$. This generically requires the compactification scale with be relatively large compared to the string scale [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In addition, the parameters A'^i and B'^i, and thus the modular weights of the light fields, are strongly constrained.

Let us discuss the second approach of sizable threshold corrections. As discussed, the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds do not lead to threshold corrections at all. Therefore, considering a particular non-minimal $\mathbf{Z}_3$ or $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold with extra particles, it will not lead to consistent unification of the coupling constants unless α_3^0 and $\sin^2\theta_W^0$ agree with the experimental values. Thus, all cases displayed in table 4 cannot be used for these two types of orbifolds, unless one introduces an intermediate scale.

For the remaining cases we assume that only one modulus contributes to eqs.(4.4). This situation is realized for the following three cases:

(i) If the orbifold has two completely rotated planes. Then the entire moduli dependence of the threshold correction is given by T_1.

(ii) If one assumes that $T_1 >> T_2, T_3$ considering an anisotropic, 'squeezed' orbifold.

(iii) If one considers an isotropic orbifold identifying the three moduli, i.e. $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$. (For orbifolds with two rotated planes cases (i) and (iii) are completely equivalent since T_2 and T_3 do not contribute to eqs.(4.4).) This possibility was discussed in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In order to realize the minimal string unification scenario, we found a unique solution for the overall modular weights of the standard model particles, assuming that the range of the overall modular weights is between -3 and -1, $-3 \leq n_\alpha \leq -1$, and also assuming generation universality:

$$\begin{aligned} &n_Q = n_D = -1,\ n_U = -2,\ n_L = n_E = -3, \\ &n_H + n_{\overline{H}} = -5, -4. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

In addition, the overall compactification scale has to be relatively large: Re$T \sim$ 16. Repeating this analyis by taking into account the allowed values of the overall modular weights of the standard model fields as shown in table 3, and abandoning

the assumption of generation universality, we obtain that minimal unification can be realized with the restriction to one overall modulus T for the following cases: $\mathbf{Z}_8'$, $\mathbf{Z}_{12}$, $\mathbf{Z}_{12}'$, $\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$, $\mathbf{Z}_6 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$. This result is summarized in the $4^{\rm th}$ column of table 1. For the other cases minimal unification is either impossible or one has to consider a squeezed orbifold.

In addition one has also to fullfill the requirements from the modular anomaly cancellation associated to the completely rotated planes. Specifically, for all orbifolds with two completely rotated planes, we have three sets of equations, which the modular weights of the standard model particles have to satisfy. Namely, there are first the conditions for complete modular anomaly cancellation with respect to the second and third complex plane, i.e.

$$A^{2,3\prime} = B^{2,3\prime} = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Eq.(4.4) is then a function of the single modulus T_1. Since $\log[(T_1+\overline{T}_1)|\eta(T_1)|^4] < 0$ for all possible values of T_1, the correct value for $\sin^2\theta_W$ is obtained provided the following condition is met: $A'^1 < 0$ ($A'^1 > 0$) if $\sin^2\theta_W^0 < \sin^2\theta_W^{\rm exp}$ ($\sin^2\theta_W^0 > \sin^2\theta_W^{\rm exp}$). Analogously, for $\alpha_3^0 > \alpha_3^{\rm exp}$ ($\alpha_3^0 < \alpha_3^{\rm exp}$) one requires $B'^1 < 0$ ($B'^1 > 0$). Additional information about the allowed values of A'^1 and B'^1 can be obtained if one eliminates the explicit T_1 dependence by combining the two equations in (4.4). In this way one finds that the ratio $\gamma = B'^1/A'^1$ has to coincide with the 'experimental' parameter γ^0, which is defined in eq.(4.5). For the minimal string unification scenario we then obtain the following third condition on the modular weights of the standard model particles:

$$A'^1 < 0, \qquad B'^1 < 0, \qquad 2.7 \leq \gamma = \frac{B'^1}{A'^1} \leq 3.7 \tag{4.8}$$

All three coupling constants meet (at the one-loop level) at $M_X = O(10^{16}{\rm GeV})$ if $\gamma = B/A = 25/7$.

Let us check these three conditions for all orbifolds with two completely rotated planes. Our results are summarized in the $5^{\rm th}$ column of table 1. For example, the $\mathbf{Z}_4$ orbifold compactifications allow for the following modular weight vectors of the standard model particles (for Kac–Moody level one): The untwisted choices are $\vec{n}_\alpha = (-1,0,0),(0,-1,0),(0,0,-1)$. In the first twisted sector with $\vec{\theta}_1 = (1/2,1/4,1/4)$ the modular weights for states without any oscillator take the form $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(1/2,3/4,3/4)$. For the particles $D_g, L_g, H, \overline{H}$ one can allow for a single

twisted oscillator either in the second or third plane. The corresponding modular weights are $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(1/2, 7/4, 3/4), -(1/2, 3/4, 7/4)$. Finally, in the second twisted sector with $\vec{\theta}_2 = (0, 1/2, 1/2)$ all standard model particles must not have any oscillator that one obtains in this sector $\vec{n}_\alpha = -(0, 1/2, 1/2)$. Thus, in total there are five different choices for the modular weights of the nine fields Q_g, U_g, E_g and seven possibilities for the eight fields $D_g, L_g, H, \overline{H}$. With the help of a computer program it is immediately checked that eqs.(4.7) and (4.8) do not possess a single solution using this range of modular weights. Thus all $\mathbf{Z}_4$ orbifold compactifications (with Kac–Moody level one) do not pass the constraints of a minimal string unification scenario.

The distribution of the allowed modular weights of the standard model particles for the remaining cases with two completely rotated planes, $\mathbf{Z}_6', \mathbf{Z}_8, \mathbf{Z}_8', \mathbf{Z}_{12}, \mathbf{Z}_{12}'$, is easily determined. Interestingly enough, none of these compactifications, except $\mathbf{Z}_8'$, is consistent with the minimal string unification scenario. On the other hand, for $\mathbf{Z}_8'$ the allowed values of the modular weights for the standard model fields provide numerous solutions to eqs.(4.7), (4.8). Thus minimal unification is in principle possible for an isotropic, but relatively large $\mathbf{Z}_8'$ orbifold. A specific solution of eqs.(4.7),(4.8) has for example the following form: $\vec{n}_{Q_{1,2,3}} = (0, -1, 0)$, $\vec{n}_{D_{1,2,3}} = (-1, 0, 0)$, $\vec{n}_{U_1} = (0, -1/2, -1/2)$, $\vec{n}_{U_{2,3}} = (-3/4, -15/8, -3/8)$, $\vec{n}_{L_1} = (-14/8, -3/8, -7/8)$, $\vec{n}_{L_{2,3}} = (-14/8, -7/8, -3/8)$, $\vec{n}_{E_1} = (-1, 0, 0)$, $\vec{n}_{E_{2,3}} = (-3/4, -15/8, -3/8)$, $\vec{n}_H = (-1/2, -3/4, -3/4)$, $\vec{n}_{\overline{H}} = (-14/8, -3/8, -7/8)$. This choice requires that $\mathrm{Re}T_1 \sim 24$.

Now turn to the $\mathbf{Z}_6$ orbifold with only one rotated plane (the third). As discussed before, minimal unification is not possible for the isotropic case with $T_1 = T_2$. Thus we demand $T_1 >> T_2$, and the modular weights n_α^2 are no longer constrained, since the threshold corrections depend only very little on T_2. (This fact comes from the T-dependence of the Dedekind function.) Thus there are only two sets of equations to be satisfied. In turn, minimal string unification is now possible. In fact there are numerous solutions of eq.(4.8) together with the anomaly requirement $A^{3\prime} = B^{3\prime} = 0$. Just for illustration, one randomly chosen solution with generation universality looks like $\vec{n}_{Q_{1,2,3}} = \vec{n}_{D_{1,2,3}} = (0, -1, 0)$, $\vec{n}_{U_{1,2,3}} = (-2/3, 0, -1/3) = \vec{n}_{E_{1,2,3}} = (-2/3, 0, -1/3)$, $\vec{n}_{L_{1,2,3}} = (-5/3, 0, -1/3)$, $\vec{n}_H = \vec{n}_{\overline{H}} = (0, 0, -1)$. In addition to satisfying the constraints on the modular weights, minimal string unification also requires a moderately large value for $\mathrm{Re}T_1$. For example, the above solution corresponds to $\mathrm{Re}T_1 \sim 10$. Let

us remark at this point that in all the relevant examples we checked that the value of $\mathrm{Re}T_1$ was not too big and dominated the tree-level coupling constant.

Finally, for all $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifolds, the constraints from modular anomaly cancellation are not anymore present, and minimal string unification is possible making again the squeezing assumption $T_1 >> T_2, T_3$. (See the last column in table 1.) For example, a possible set of modular weights that satisfies eq.(4.8) has the following form, considering the $\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ orbifold: $\vec{n}_{Q_{1,2,3}} = (-1/2, -1/2, 0)$, $\vec{n}_{U_{1,2,3}} = \vec{n}_{L_{1,2,3}} = \vec{n}_{E_{1,2,3}} = \vec{n}_H = (-1, 0, 0)$, $\vec{n}_{D_{1,2,3}} = \vec{n}_{\overline{H}} = (0, -1, 0)$. In addition, the $\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$ and $\mathbf{Z}_6 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$ orbifolds also allow for minimal string unification with $T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ (see the 5^{th} column of table 1).

The conclusion of the above analysis is that $\mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds cannot accommodate a model in which the only charged fields with respect to $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ are those of the minimal supersymmetric standard model except $\mathbf{Z}_6$ and $\mathbf{Z}_8'$. A $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifolds can also yield adequate coupling unification in general. Thus we are able to rule out the existence and possible experimental consistency of large classes of 4-D strings based on (0,2) orbifolds.

The above specific analysis was done assuming the low energy particle content of the minimal supersymmetric standard model, but it may obviously be straightforwardly applied to any extended model. In particular, one can repeat the analysis e.g. for any of the extended models of table 4 in which the massless spectrum is enlarged by including some extra chiral multiplets [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.58"¿58(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.57"¿57(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. In order for any of those models to yield consistent unified couplings, one must have e.g. $A^{1'}/B^{1'} \sim \gamma^0$ and adequate cancellation of modular anomalies in the rotated planes (if there are any). The signs of the A' and B' also have to be appropriate. We refrain from presenting a complete analysis of all the models in table 4. It is however worth remarking that the conditions for adequate coupling unification through threshold effects are in some cases more easy to fulfill than in others. For example, it is easier to make the extended models b and j in table 4 agree with experiment than the minimal model itself. The extended model b contains extra fields $O = (\underline{8}, \underline{1}, 0)$ and $T = (\underline{1}, \underline{3}, 0)$ as well as an extra pair of multiplets transforming like right-handed electrons. The massless fields O and T appear in possible grand unified models in which the (e.g. $SU(5)$) symmetry is broken by a Higgs field in

the adjoint [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.58"¿58(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This requires an original string model with higher Kac–Moody level. Thus, using for simplicity only the overall modulus T, one finds adequate values for $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3, using only the most common overall modular weights $-1, -2$. One possible solution is found for $\mathrm{Re}T = 7.0$ and generation-independent modular weights

$$\begin{aligned} n_Q &= n_L = n_E = n_{\overline{H}} = -1, \\ n_U &= n_D = n_H = -2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

with the modular weights of the extra particles $(O + T + E + \overline{E})$ equal to -1. The same happens with model j, which was considered in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.57"¿57(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This includes extra fields transforming like conjugate pairs $Q + \overline{Q} + D + \overline{D}$, which may be available at Kac–Moody level one. For example, one can find good agreement with experiment for $\mathrm{Re}T = 9.0$ and flavor-independent modular weights

$$\begin{aligned} n_U &= n_D = n_E = -1, \\ n_Q &= n_L = n_H = n_{\overline{H}} = -2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

with the modular weights of the extra $(Q+\overline{Q}+D+\overline{D})$ fields equal to -1. Many other solutions giving up flavor-independence and considering the three complex moduli exist for both models. The important point is that in either case, one does not need to have massless fields with modular weight ≤ -3 to obtain good agreement. Although we have not done a complete scan for all $\mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds, this seems to imply that, unlike what happens with the minimal model, one can have various $\mathbf{Z}_N$ models with correct $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3 results at the price of adding some particular extra massless fields. In addition, isotropic $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ orbifolds, described by an overall modulus T, should also be allowed. This is a different approach to that in [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.57"¿57(2.8)html:¡/A¿] where two extra mass scales are introduced in order to get good agreement for the model j. In the present approach no extra mass scales are needed and the string threshold effects render the results consistent with experiment.

(2.8)html:¡A name="section.5"¿5.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Constraints on SUSY-breaking soft terms from duality invariant actions.

We will now turn to a different type of application of the target-space duality symmetries in 4-D orbifold strings. It is well known that in low-energy supergravity theories [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.59"¿59(2.8)html:¡/A¿], if supersymmetry breaking occurs in a *hidden sector* of the theory, soft-susy breaking terms are generated in the non-singlet *observable sector*. Since the effective low energy Lagrangian from strings is an $N = 1$ supergravity theory, the same type of soft susy-breaking terms will be generated in this case. The possible soft terms will include i) gaugino Majorana masses M_a, ii) soft scalar mass terms of the type $m_\alpha^2 \phi_\alpha \phi_\alpha^*$ for each of the scalars in the theory, and iii) soft scalar couplings proportional to each of the superpotential terms. In principle there are as many different soft terms as independent particles and/or couplings present. Simplifying assumptions reduce the number of independent soft terms by imposing some hypothetical symmetry which might be present at the GUT/Planck scale. The presence of these soft terms reflects itself into the SUSY-particle mass spectrum at low energies. If the idea of low-energy supersymmetry is correct, the latter should be amenable to experimental tests in future accelerators. It would thus be very important to find constraints on the pattern of SUSY-breaking soft terms in effective low-energy Lagrangians from strings.

This might look hopeless, since we know that in string theory supersymmetry breaking necessarily has to be a non-perturbative phenomenon and we are far from a non-perturbative understanding of string theory. This view is, however, unnecessarily pessimistic. One does not need to understand all the details of a symmetry-breaking process in order to obtain important physical information. The most obvious example of this is the standard model itself: we do not know how the symmetry breaking process $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{em}$ takes place yet; that does not stop us from computing all the extremely successful predictions of the standard model. Simply assuming that there is a certain doublet scalar field (fundamental or composite), which gets a *vev* $v \neq 0$, is enough to obtain most of the relevant information in the standard model, we do not need to know how or why it happens so. In the same way one might hope to get some physical information about the susy-breaking soft terms without knowing all the non-perturbative dynamics from which they originate. In

particular, as we now describe, one can get some interesting information about those terms in effective low-energy theories from orbifold-like 4-dimensional strings.

Most supersymmetry-breaking scenarios discussed up to now [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.60"¿60(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.61"¿61(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)htm href="#reference.8"¿8(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.9"¿9(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.62"¿62(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)htm href="#reference.52"¿52(2.8)html:¡/A¿] in the context of strings assume that the "seed" for SUSY-breaking is provided by the auxiliary fields of the dilaton S and the moduli T_i. On the other hand, as we have discussed in the previous sections, the matter field kinetic terms depend on the moduli T_i in a way parametrized by the modular weights. As we will now discuss, this fact makes the soft SUSY-breaking terms depend in a known way on the modular weights and allow us to draw some constraints on them.

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.5.1"¿5.1.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Gaugino masses

Let us consider a $(0,2)$ type of 4-D string based on an Abelian $\mathbf{Z}_N$ or $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$ as the ones discussed in prev sections. We want to address now the question of the soft gaugino masses M_a in this type of theories. The value of those masses is given in a general $N = 1$ supergravity Lagrangian by [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.21"¿21(2.8)html:¡/A¿]

$$M_a \;=\; \sum_{\alpha} \; f_a^{\alpha}(\phi_\alpha) \; K^{-1}_{\alpha\overline{\beta}} \; G_{\overline{\beta}}. \tag{5.1}$$

f_a^α is the derivative of the gauge kinetic function f_a with respect to the field ϕ_α, $K^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the inverse Kähler metric and $G_\alpha = \partial G/\partial\phi_\alpha$ is the auxiliary field of ϕ_α, where $G(\phi_\alpha, \overline{\phi}_\alpha) = K(\phi_\alpha, \overline{\phi}_\alpha) + \log|W(\phi_\alpha)|^2$ is the $N = 1$ Kähler function. The sum runs over all massless chiral fields and a labels each gauge group factor. In principle the f-function could also depend on the charged matter fields but the presence of those fields in f is severely constrained by gauge invariance. Thus we will discuss only the S–field and gauge singlet moduli dependence of the gauge kinetic function. Furthermore, as discussed in the previous section, one expects for orbifolds the T_i-dependent piece to

be the leading one-loop contribution to f due to the exponential large-T behaviour of the η functions. Thus the gauge kinetic function has the general form

$$f_a(S, M_i) = k_a S + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\Delta(M_i). \tag{5.2}$$

Here, $\Delta(M_i)$ is the one-loop threshold contribution from the massive string excitations given in terms of automorphic functions of the corresponding duality group Γ. The moduli dependence of the holomorphic gauge kinetic function was already noted in [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.63"¿63(2.8)html:¡/A¿] in the context of truncating the ten-dimensional effective Lagrangian of the heterotic string. Then the gaugino masses take the form

$$M_a = k_a(K^{-1}_{S\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{S\overline{M}_i}G_{\overline{M}_i}) + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\frac{\partial\Delta_a(M_i)}{\partial M_i}(K^{-1}_{M_i\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{M_i\overline{M}_j}G_{\overline{M}_j}). \tag{5.3}$$

Here we have allowed for a mixing between the S–fields and the moduli in kinetic energy which is expected to occur beyond the tree-level [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.63"¿63(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. It is important to realize that the above expression for the gaugino masses is not target space duality-invariant since $\frac{\partial\Delta_a(M_i)}{\partial M_i}$ transforms inhomogeneously under duality transformations. Duality invariance is restored when one also includes the moduli dependent one-loop contribution of the massless fields to the effective Yang-Mills Lagrangian. This is just a SUSY counterpart of the non-holomorphic contribution to the gauge kinetic terms discussed in section 3. Specifically, the non-local Lagrangian eq.(3.1) together with the threshold corrections leads to the following expression for the gaugino masses valid in general compactification schemes:

$$\begin{aligned} M_a = {} & k_a(K^{-1}_{S\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{S\overline{M}_i}G_{\overline{M}_i}) \\ & + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\Bigg(\frac{\partial\Delta_a(M_i)}{\partial M_i} - 2\big[C(G_a) - \sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)\big]\frac{\partial K(M_i,\overline{M}_i)}{\partial M_i} \\ & + 4\sum_{\underline{R}_a} T(\underline{R}_a)\frac{\partial \log\det K^{\rm matter}_{\alpha\beta}(M_i,\overline{M}_i)}{\partial M_i}\Bigg)(K^{-1}_{M_i\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{M_i\overline{M}_j}G_{\overline{M}_j}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Now let us compute above expressions for orbifold compactifications. The holomorphic gauge kinetic function is determined by the threshold corrections eq.(4.1)

and has the form [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.8"¿8(2.8)html:¡/A¿],[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.6"¿6(2.8)html:¡/A¿],[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.14"¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿] (by the same reasons as in the previous chapter we neglect the U_m dependence of the threshold corrections in the following):

$$f_a(S,T_i) = k_a S - \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i=1}^{3}(b'^i_a - k_a\delta^i_{GS})\log\eta(T_i)^4. \tag{5.5}$$

Then one finds for the gaugino masses

$$\begin{aligned} M_a &= f_a^S(K^{-1}_{S\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{S\overline{T}_i}G_{\overline{T}_i}) + f_a^{T_i}(K^{-1}_{T_i\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{T_i\overline{T}_j}G_{\overline{T}_j}) = \\ &= k_a(K^{-1}_{S\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{S\overline{T}_i}G_{\overline{T}_i}) + \frac{1}{16\pi^3}(b'^i_a - k_a\delta^i_{GS})G_2(T_i)(K^{-1}_{T_i\overline{S}}G_{\overline{S}} + K^{-1}_{T_i\overline{T}_j}G_{\overline{T}_j}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where $G_2(T) = -4\pi\frac{\partial\eta(T)}{\partial T}/\eta(T)$ is the holomorphic Eisenstein function. Again we notice that the above expression is *not* modular invariant since the function $G_2(T)$ transforms in an "anomalous way" under modular transformations: $G_2(T) \to (icT + d)^2 G_2(T) - 2\pi ic(icT+d)$. The gaugino mass is made modular invariant by the further contribution from the *massless* fields of the theory, which is proportional to $2b'^a_i/(T_i + \overline{T}_i)$. This induces a replacement of $b'^i_a G_2(T_i)$ in eq.(5.6) by the modified weight two (non-holomorphic) Eisenstein function $b'^i_a\widehat{G}_2(T_i)$ which transforms as $\widehat{G}_2 \to \widehat{G}_2(icT_i + d)^2$ and admits an expansion

$$\widehat{G}_2(T_i,\overline{T}_i) \;=\; G_2(T_i) \;-\; \frac{2\pi}{T_i+\overline{T}_i} \;\simeq\; \frac{\pi^2}{3} \;-\; \frac{2\pi}{T_i+\overline{T}_i} \;-\; 8\pi^2 e^{-2\pi T_i} \;-\; .... \tag{5.7}$$

We do not know the physical *vev*'s of the relevant fields S, T_i, nor the auxiliary fields which break supersymmetry $G_{\overline{S}}, G_{\overline{T}_i}$ nor the higher-loop expressions for the inverse Kähler metrics. However our ignorance can be parametrized in terms of some unknown parameters and eq.(5.6) can be rewritten:

$$M_a \;=\; M^0(S,T_i)\; k_a \;+\; \sum_{i=1}^{3}\; b'^i_a\; M'^i(S,T_i). \tag{5.8}$$

Here M^0 is a gauge group independent parameter and all the group dependence is included in the second term. If we have m independent gauge groups $a = 1, 2.., m$, one can eliminate the universal piece by taking linear combinations

$$\sum_{a=1}^{m}\; V_a\;\frac{M_a}{k_a}\;; \qquad \sum_{a}^{m}\; V_a \;=\; 0, \tag{5.9}$$

where the V_a are appropriately chosen constants. If the number of gauge groups is bigger than the number of free parameters, one will get constraints amongst the m physical gaugino masses.

All gaugino masses will be equal (modulo the corresponding Kac–Moody level) for the $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds with three completely rotated complex planes. Also, if a large gauge group unifies the m different gauge groups, all the ${b'}_a^i$s will be equal and again we will have universal boundary conditions for gaugino masses. This is the case, for instance, of an $SU(5)$ symmetry unifying the three interactions of the standard model and it is the usual assumption that is taken in the minimal supersymmetric standard model, i.e. universal gaugino masses.

In a more general case, there will be four unknown parameters $M^0, {M'}^1, {M'}^2, {M'}^3$, which will generically lead to non-universal gaugino masses for any non-unified string model. In certain situations one expects a reduction to two in the number of free parameters. Indeed, if any of the following three possibilities is realized, only two parameters, M_0 and M', will be relevant (see also the discussion about these three cases concerning the unification of the coupling constants in section 4):

(i) If the particular orbifold considered has just one plane that is left (for some particular twist) unrotated. If the relevant plane is the i^{th} one, only ${M'}^i$ will be non-vanishing.

(ii) If the supersymmetry-breaking dynamics are such that the modulus of a particular complex plane plays a leading role (i.e. $|G_{T_1}| \gg |G_{T_2}|, |G_{T_3}|$), then only one of the ${M'}^i$s will be relevant. This normally corresponds to $T_1 >> T_2, T_3$.

(iii) If we concentrate on the diagonal modulus one has, $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ and hence one expects ${M'}^1 = {M'}^2 = {M'}^3 \equiv M'$. This is equivalent assuming an approximate symmetry among the three complex planes leading to $G_{T_1} = G_{T_2} = G_{T_3}$ for the auxiliary fields. In fact this is an assumption that is often made in the supersymmetry-breaking scenarios discussed up to now.

In these three cases, the number of free parameters will be two, M_0 and M', and hence we will get constraints on the soft gaugino masses as long as the number of group factors is larger than two. Physically the most interesting non-trivial case is that of three gauge group factors, which includes the standard model and some of its more interesting extensions: $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_R$,

and $SU(3)_c \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$. Let us first discuss the case of the standard model group. One can take two different linear combinations of gaugino masses as in eq.(5.9), for example, one with $\vec{V}_A = (k_1, k_2, -k_1 - k_2)$ and the other with $\vec{V}_B = (k_2, -k_2, 0)$, where k_a are the Kac–Moody levels of the standard model group (the reasons for this choice will become clear below). Let us call these linear combinations M_B and M_A respectively. Taking the ratio of the two, one finds:

$$\gamma_M \equiv \frac{M_B}{M_A} = \frac{M_1 + M_2 - \frac{(k_1+k_2)}{k_3} M_3}{\frac{k_2}{k_1} M_1 - M_2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{3} B'^i M'^i}{\sum_{i=1}^{3} A'^i M'^i}, \tag{5.10}$$

where A'^i and B'^i are the linear combinations of b's discussed in section 3 and the sum runs over the three orbifold complex planes. This is why we took the particular linear combinations M_A and M_B, since in this way we can connect the gaugino masses to the threshold corrections discussed in section 4. One can also rewrite the above equation as

$$M_1 \, (1 - \gamma_M \frac{k_2}{k_1}) + M_2 \, (1 + \gamma_M) - \frac{k_1 + k_2}{k_3} M_3 = 0. \tag{5.11}$$

Consider first cases (i) and (iii) discussed above, in which only one M' variable is relevant; the explicit T_i dependence of γ_M drops and one can write

$$\gamma_M = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{3} B'^i}{\sum_{i=1}^{3} A'^i} = \frac{B'}{A'} = \gamma \tag{5.12}$$

where γ was defined in section 3. Thus in that class of models one has $\gamma_M = \gamma$ and one can obtain specific constraints amongst gaugino masses if one has a knowledge of the b'-coefficients, i.e. if one knows the massless spectrum and the modular weights of the massless particles.

There are several cases in which γ_M can be easily computed without a detailed knowledge of each string model:

1) There are large classes of models in which one has $b'_a = b_a$. This is the case of $\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ symmetric $(0,2)$ orbifolds, which can also be constructed (at their multicritical T_i values) in terms of the free-fermion method. This will also be the case of models with all the physically relevant particles either in the untwisted sector or in twisted sectors with one unrotated plane and no oscillator contribution. In all these

cases the overall modular weights of the particles is -1 and hence $b'_a = b_a$. In these cases one has

$$\gamma_M \;=\; \gamma \;=\; \frac{B'}{A'} \;=\; \frac{B}{A}\;, \tag{5.13}$$

and one can compute γ_M if one just knows the massless $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ spectrum of the theory. For example, we discussed in the previous chapter how one can enlarge the particle content of the minimal SUSY-model by adding extra multiplets in order to get the correct measured values for $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3. Since the β-functions for all these possibilities are known, one can compute for each of them $\gamma_M = \gamma = B/A$. The values of B/A for some extended models of this type may be found in the last column of table 4. They vary in a range $3 \sim 6$. For example, if one considers a level one model with $3/5k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1$, the last possibility (model j) [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.57"¿57(2.8)html:¡/A¿]) with $\gamma_M = 5$ would give rise to the constraint among gaugino masses

$$2M_1 \;-\; 6M_2 \;+\; \frac{8}{3}M_3 \;=\; 0\;. \tag{5.14}$$

Notice that the relevant spectrum in computing the b's is the one present *just below* the Planck scale. Whether some of the massless particles at that level get an intermediate mass or not does not modify the T-dependence of the f-function and hence does not affect the string boundary conditions.

2) In other classes of models one can get information on γ (and hence on γ_M) by imposing that the string threshold corrections adequately explain the discrepancy between the naive string result for $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3 and the experimental results [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This was discussed in detail in the previous section. We saw that, if we restrict ourselves to one modulus, we need to have $2.7 \leq \gamma \leq 3.7$ for the minimal string unification scenario. Furthermore, one has $\gamma = 25/7$ if one wants the three couplings to join at a scale $\simeq 10^{16}$ GeV [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.20"¿20(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. Thus in this case one would get a constraint

$$M_1 \;-\; 4\;M_2 \;+\; \frac{4}{3}\;M_3 \;=\; 0\;. \tag{5.15}$$

Let us now discuss the case (ii) in which the number of relevant free parameters reduces to two. Then, instead of eq.(5.12), one has $\gamma_M = \frac{B'^1}{A'^1} = \gamma$. If in this case one also insists in explaining the needed corrections to $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3 purely in terms of

string threshold corrections one will again have $2.7 \leq \gamma = B_1/A_1 \leq 3.7$, and γ_M will also be restricted by those limits.

The advantage of the situations discussed above is that we do not need to know details about the specific string model nor the supersymmetry-breaking mechanism to get interesting physical constraints. Notice that there is a possible limiting situation in which $M^0 = 0$. In this case we would be left with a unique free parameter M' and one has

$$\frac{M_1}{b'_1} \;=\; \frac{M_2}{b'_2} \;=\; \frac{M_3}{b'_3}. \tag{5.16}$$

This situation is not in general expected. For example, in ref. [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿] it was found that for a typical modular invariant non-perturbative potential the minima must have $G_S \neq 0$ for the potential to be stable.

All the above discussion can be straightforwardly generalized to the other extended gauge models with three gauge factors. Consider one such extended model with three gauge groups labelled by an index $a = 1, 2, 3$ in such a way that the three $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3)$ generators ($\alpha = 1, 2, 3$) can be written as

$$I_\alpha \;=\; \sum_{a=1}^{3} \; c_{\alpha a} \; T_a \; . \tag{5.17}$$

The relationship between the Kac–Moody levels is given by $k_\alpha \;=\; \sum_a \; c^2_{\alpha a} \; k_a$. Define two linear combinations of gaugino masses, M_A and M_B, by taking

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \; \sum_{a=1}^{3} \; a_\alpha \; c^2_{\alpha,a} \; M_a, \tag{5.18}$$

where $\vec{V}_A = (k_1, k_2, -k_1 - k_2)$ for M_A and $\vec{V}_B = (k_2, -k_2, 0)$ for M_B. Then one finds

$$\gamma_M \;=\; \frac{M_1 \;+\; M_2 \;-\; \frac{(k_1+k_2)}{k_3} \; M_3}{\frac{k_1}{k_2} \; M_1 \;-\; M_2} \;=\; \frac{B'_{\rm ext.}}{A'_{\rm ext.}} \;\equiv\; \gamma_{\rm ext.} \; , \tag{5.19}$$

where one defines

$$A'_{\rm ext} \;=\; \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \; \frac{V_A^\alpha}{k_\alpha} \; \sum_a \; c^2_{\alpha a} \; b'_a, \qquad B'_{\rm ext} \;=\; \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \; \frac{V_B^\alpha}{k_\alpha} \; \sum_a \; c^2_{\alpha a} \; b'_a \; . \tag{5.20}$$

We see in the above formulae that the value of γ_M is determined by the value of the b'_a-coefficients of the extended theory which is valid *at the string scale*. One can then use eq.(5.11) and the relationship between the Kac–Moody levels of the standard model and those of the extended theory to derive the relevant constraint. The result is independent of the scale in which the extended symmetry is broken down to the standard model. For example, in the case of $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ one gets $A'_{\rm ext} = b'_R + b'_L - (k_R + k_L)/k_4\, b'_4$ and $B'_{\rm ext} = (k_R + 2/3k_4)/k_L\, b'_L - b'_R - 2/3\, b'_4$. These are also the coefficients that are relevant for the threshold corrections to the computations of α_3 and $\sin^2\theta_W$ for this particular extended gauge model.

Let us finally comment that all the above gaugino mass relationships apply at the string scale. In order to make contact with the low-energy physical quantities one has to take into account two facts. First, one has to redefine the Planck mass gaugino fields in order to reabsorve the non-minimal kinetic terms (proportional to $f_a(M_{string})$). Second, one has to run down the gaugino masses according to the renormalization group equations. In fact it is well known that gaugino masses are renormalized [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.64"¿64(2.8)html:¡/A¿] in exactly the same way as the corresponding coupling constant and the ratio $M_a(\mu)/\alpha_a(\mu)$ is renormalization group invariant. The net effect of these two points is the replacement $M_a(M_{\rm string}) \to M_a(M_W)/\alpha_a(M_W)$ in eq.(5.11). In this way the corresponding low-energy constraint is obtained.

(2.8)html:¡A name="subsection.5.2"¿5.2.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Scalar masses

It is also useful to display the explicit dependence of the soft SUSY-breaking scalar masses on the modular weights. The scalar potential in the effective low-energy supergravity action has the form [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.21"¿21(2.8)html:¡/A¿]

$$V = e^G \left\{ \sum_{\alpha,\beta} G_{\phi_\alpha} G_{\overline{\phi}_\beta} K^{-1}_{\phi_\alpha \overline{\phi}_\beta} - 3 \right\}, \tag{5.21}$$

where K is the total Kähler potential and sum runs over all charged massless chiral fields ϕ_α (we neglect here D-terms which are irrelevant in the present analysis). One may describe the relevant non-perturbative effects that break supersymmetry through the introduction of a non-vanishing (non-perturbative) superpotential for the moduli fields of the string, $W_0(S, T_i)$ [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.60"¿60(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A

href="#reference.8"¿8(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. This seems reasonable since supersymmetry breaking needs to be a field-theoretical phenomenon occurring well below the string scale if it is going to be of any use in solving the hierarchy problem. One usually assumes also that supersymmetry breaking takes place in a "hidden sector" of the theory which communicates with the "observable world" only gravitationally. It is this "hidden sector" which will generate the non-perturbative superpotential W_0 and generate supersymmetry-breaking. This is precisely the situation in the gaugino condensation mechanism abundantly discussed in the literature [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.60"¿60(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.61"¿61(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.8"¿8(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.9"¿9(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.62"¿62(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.52"¿52(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. We will however simply assume that supersymmetry breaking occurs somehow giving rise to non-vanishing vacuum expectation values for the auxiliary fields of the marginal-operator fields S, T_i.

Let us consider the scalar potential for orbifold compactifications. One can expand the scalar potential V around the classical values [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html: of the matter fields $A_\alpha = 0$:

$$V \;=\; V_0(S,\overline{S},T_i,\overline{T}_i) \;+\; \sum_\alpha V_{1\alpha}(S,\overline{S},T_i,\overline{T}_i)\; A_\alpha\overline{A}_\alpha \;+\ldots. \tag{5.22}$$

Writing $K \;= -\log(S+\overline{S}) + K_0(T_i,\overline{T}_i) \;+\; K^{\rm matter}(T_i,\overline{T}_i)A_\alpha\overline{A}_\alpha$, see eq.(2.23), one finds

$$\begin{aligned} V_0 &= \frac{e^{K_0}}{(S+\overline{S})}\left\{(S+\overline{S})^2|D_S W_0|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 K^{-1}_{0T_i\overline{T}_i}|D_{T_i}W_0|^2 - 3|W_0|^2\right\}, \\ V_{1\alpha} &= \frac{e^{K_0}K^{\rm matter}}{(S+\overline{S})}\left\{(S+\overline{S})^2|D_S W_0|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 K^{-1}_{0T_i\overline{T}_i}|D_{T_i}W_0|^2\times\right. \\ &\qquad \left.\left[1 - \frac{K^{\rm matter}_{T_i\overline{T}_i}}{K_{0T_i\overline{T}_i}K^{\rm matter}} + \frac{K^{\rm matter}_{T_i}K^{\rm matter}_{\overline{T}_i}}{(K^{\rm matter})^2 K_{0T_i\overline{T}_i}}\right] - 2|W_0|^2\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

With the explicit form of $K^{\rm matter}$ in terms of the modular weights n^i_α one can easily check that the quantity in brackets in $V_{1\alpha}$ is equal to $1+n^i_\alpha$. Rescaling the matter

fields in order to get properly normalized particles, one finally gets a general expression for the soft scalar masses of the form

$$m_\alpha^2 \;=\; m_0^2(S,T_i,\overline{T}_i) \;+\; \sum_{i=1}^{3}\; n_\alpha^i \; m'^2(S,T_i,\overline{T}_i). \tag{5.24}$$

The first term in the right-hand side is universal (i.e. does not depend on the particular matter field A_α considered) and one can easily check that

$$m_0^2 \;=\; m_{3/2}^2 \;+\; V_0, \tag{5.25}$$

where $m_{3/2}^2 = \exp K_0 |W_0|^2$ is the gravitino mass squared and V_0 is essentially the cosmological constant. The second term in eq.(5.24) depends on the modular weight n_α^i of the field A_α along each of the three complex planes and is in general not universal. In eq.(5.24) m'^2 is positive-definite, whereas m_0^2 is not, since V_0 may be negative. Indeed, for simple examples of W_0, the absolute minimum of the scalar potential leads to $V_0 < 0$ [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.8"¿8(2.8)html:¡/A¿,(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. One can, on the other hand, find examples [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿] in which $V_0 = 0$ and hence $m_0^2 = m_{3/2}^2$. The mass^2 of matter fields may in general be negative (and hence the potential unstable) unless certain conditions are fullfilled (eq. 4.11 in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.10"¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿]). We assume here that those conditions are fullfilled or, more generally, that the minimum of the potential is stable. Equation (5.24) shows that, contrary to the standard assumptions in the minimal low-energy supersymmetric models [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.59"¿59(2.8)html:¡/A¿], the soft scalar masses are *not universal* but depend on the modular weights of the particles. In particular, fields with higher (negative) modular weight have smaller soft masses than those with smaller weight. Since generically the modular weights of each individual physical field are unknown, it is not easy to obtain definite constraints on scalar masses in a model-independent way. If one considers the simplified case of a single modulus, e.g. the diagonal modulus $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$, one can, as we did with the gaugino case, form ratios of scalar masses combinations in which the explicit dependence on the unknown m_0^2, m'^2 parameters drops. Thus, e.g. consider the three u-like squarks $\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{c}, \widetilde{t}$. In the above scheme one would get

$$\frac{m_{\widetilde{u}}^2 \;-\; m_{\widetilde{c}}^2}{m_{\widetilde{u}}^2 \;-\; m_{\widetilde{t}}^2} \;=\; \frac{n_u \;-\; n_c}{n_u \;-\; n_t}, \tag{5.26}$$

where the n's are the overall modular weights of each particle. We know from the absence of flavor-changing neutral currents in kaon decays that $m^2_{\tilde{u}}$ and $m^2_{\tilde{c}}$ must be almost degenerate for the SUSY-GIM mechanism to work. This would suggest the construction of string models in which both fields have similar modular weights (or else SUSY-breaking mechanisms in which $m'^2 \ll m_0^2$). Notice that (unlike the gaugino case) in the case of scalar masses the above non-universality effects may be present even if there is a unification symmetry like $SU(5)$.

In the absence of a knowledge of the modular weights of the physical quark and lepton fields, one can try to form combinations of scalar masses which could somehow be related to the particular combinations of modular weights included in the quantities A' and B' discussed in previous sections. Consider as an example the minimal particle content of the SUSY standard model and take the following two combinations of soft scalar masses

$$\sum_{g=\text{gen.}} (2m_Q^{g\,2} - m_U^{g\,2} - m_E^{g\,2}) = (\frac{5}{8}\delta A + \frac{1}{8}\delta B)\; m'^2(S,T)$$
$$\sum_{g=\text{gen.}} (3m_Q^{g\,2} - 2m_U^{g\,2} + m_L^{g\,2} - m_D^{g\,2} - m_E^{g\,2}) = \qquad (5.27)$$
$$(\frac{5}{4}\delta A - \frac{1}{4}\delta B - 2 - (n_H + n_{\overline{H}}))\; m'^2(S,T)$$

where $\delta A \equiv A - A'$, $\delta B \equiv B - B'$. The sum runs over the three quark-lepton generations. Taking the ratio of the two equations one cancels the dependence on m' and gets a sum-rule in terms of δA,δB and the sum $n_H + n_{\overline{H}}$. If we have some information about those quantities (e.g. from imposing that the string threshold corrections yield the correct result for $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3) one can in principle check the consistency of the model by checking the corresponding sum rule.

As in the gaugino case, all the above relationships apply at the string scale. From that scale down to low energies $O(M_W)$ the masses evolve according to the renormalization group equations [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.64"¿64(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. If the particles have the same $SU(3)\times SU(2)\times U(1)$ quantum numbers equations like (5.26) directly apply at low energies (up to Yukawa couplings).

(2.8)html:¡A name="section.6"¿6.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ Final comments and conclusions

In this paper we have analysed several implications of the duality invariance of 4-D orbifold strings. One of the merits of our argumentation is that it allows us to discard large classes of models without needing to work in a (hopeless) model-by-model basis. An important point is the necessary cancellation of target-space one-loop modular anomalies. We have shown how, in analogy with the ordinary ABJ anomalies, such a cancellation strongly constrains the massless fermion content of the theory. This allows us to prove how certain massless fermion contents are incompatible with cancellation of duality anomalies for certain orbifolds. This is the case of generic (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_3$ and $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifolds for which duality anomaly cancellation forbids the existence of models whose massless charged sector with respect to $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ is that of the minimal supersymmetric standard model. Such constraints do also exist for other gauge groups and particle contents.

For other $\mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds the target-space modular anomaly cancellation conditions are less restrictive. If those conditions are combined with the additional requirement of getting adequate gauge coupling unification results for $\sin^2\theta_W$ and α_3, the above minimal string scenario is ruled out for all $\mathbf{Z}_N$ orbifolds except $\mathbf{Z}_6$ and $\mathbf{Z}'_8$. A consistent unification scenario with the massless content of the minimal supersymmetric standard model is also possible for $\mathbf{Z}_N \times \mathbf{Z}_M$. Alternatively, one can modify the massless particle content of the minimal supersymmetric standard model and add additional vector-like fields; in this case the constraints often become weaker, as discussed at the end of section 4. Further alternatives include the construction of higher Kac–Moody level models or intermediate scale symmetry breaking through flat (or quasi-flat) directions.

Whichever (if any) of these possibilities is actually realized, we think it fair to say that the simplest possibility of direct string unification of the minimal supersymmetric standard model does not appear to be an immediate possibility in 4-D (0,2) orbifold strings. Extra massless particles and/or intermediate scales and/or distorted orbifold shape and/or higher Kac–Moody levels seem to be required.

Another topic discussed in the paper is the soft SUSY-breaking terms present in the low-energy effective Lagrangian once supersymmetry is broken. Assuming that the auxiliary fields of the dilaton S and moduli T_i are the seed of supersymmetry

breaking one can obtain the explicit dependence of the soft gaugino and scalar masses on the modular weights of the massless chiral fields. This explicitly shows that in generic string models the soft scalar masses are *not* universal but depend on the modular weight of the particle. Similarly, one sees that (in non-unified models) the soft gaugino masses are gauge group dependent. The departure from universality of gaugino masses may be related in specific models to the gauge coupling constant threshold effects. In some cases specific mass relationships are found.

Most of the above topics were discussed in the context of 4-D (0,2) orbifolds. Some general features (see beginning of sections 2 and 3) are expected to hold in other classes of 4-D strings. It is known that non-orbifold 4-D strings do also have infinite discrete duality symmetries physically rather similar (but mathematically different) to the modular group of toroidal compactifications [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.26"¿26(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. It is difficult to say which of the properties present in the toroidal compactifications will still be present in more general (0,2) non-flat compactifications. It is conceivable that at least some of the latter models may also have "universal" moduli (analogous to the "completely rotated" moduli of orbifolds) whose generalized duality anomalies may only be cancelled by a Green–Schwarz mechanism. The cancellation of duality anomalies with respect to such type of moduli would give rise to constraints similar to those in eqs.(3.10) and (3.17). One also expects the existence of other moduli explicitly contributing to gauge threshold effects if there are string massive modes whose mass depends on such moduli. The relevant threshold effects will involve generalized automorphic forms [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.43"¿43(2.8)html:¡/A¿] (appropriate generalizations of the Dedekind function to non-toroidal strings). If this was the case most of our discussion could be generalized to these compactifications. Relationships amongst gaugino masses similar to the ones discussed in section 5 would also be expected.

We acknowledge usefull discussions with A. Casas, W. Lerche, J. Louis, C. Muñoz and F. Quevedo.

Appendix (2.8)html:¡A name="appendix.A"¿A.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ A $\mathbf{Z}_7$ example

As a first example we consider now the computation of the σ-model anomalies in the (2,2) $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold. We take this example because it explicitly shows the generic appearance of multiple oscillator states (and hence of high negative modular weights) in Abelian orbifolds. The (2,2) $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold [(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.12"¿12(2.8)html:¡/A¿],[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.47"¿47(2.8)html:¡/A¿] has as gauge group $E_6 \times U(1)^2 \times E_8$, and the massless charged chiral fields are the following. The fields in the untwisted sector transform as $3(\underline{27} + \underline{1})$. There are three independent twisted sectors of order θ, θ^2 and θ^4, where θ denotes the order seven elementary twist (the twisted sectors θ^6, θ^5 and θ^3 contain the corresponding antiparticles). Each one of these three sectors contains seven copies of $\underline{27}$'s (corresponding to the seven fixed points of the orbifold). In addition there are twisted oscillator states which are singlets under $E_6 \times E_8$. For example, in the θ sector one finds states with the following oscillator number N and creation operators α^i, $\widetilde{\alpha}^i$:

$$\begin{aligned} N &= 1/7 \to \alpha^1 \\ N &= 2/7 \to \alpha^2 \ , \ (\alpha^1)^2 \\ N &= 4/7 \to \alpha^3 \ , \ (\alpha^2)^2 \ , \ (\widetilde{\alpha}^3)(\alpha^1) \ , \ (\alpha^2)(\alpha^1)^2 \ , \ (\alpha^1)^4 \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where the superindex of the oscillators denotes the relevant complex plane in which the oscillator is acting. Similar oscillators exist in the other θ^2 and θ^4 sectors with the oscillator superindices permuted. With the above information, one can easily check that, since all the three planes in the $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold are completely rotated, one has

$$b'^i_{E_6} \ = \ b'^i_{E_8} \ = \ \frac{1}{24} \ b'^i_{\rm grav}. \tag{A.2}$$

Let us check this result for the overall modulus and leave the plane-by-plane case as an exercise for the reader. For the E_8 group the result is, of course, $b'_{E_8} = -3 \times 30 = -90$. For E_6 we only need to know that the three untwisted $\underline{27}$'s have modular weight -1 and that the twisted ones have modular weights -2. Thus one again gets $b'_{E_6} = -3 \times 12 + 3 \times 3 - 21 \times 3 = -90$. The same can be checked for the $U(1)^2$. The case of the gravitational anomalies is trickier. In this case all singlet chiral fields contribute. In particular, the structure of modular weights for the above oscillators

plays an important role. The field with oscillator number $N = 1/7$ has modular weight -3, the two fields with $N = 2/7$ have modular weights -3,-4 and the five states with $N = 4/7$ have modular weights $-3, -4, -2, -5, -6$ respectively. On the other hand the dimension of the gauge group is dim $G = 328$ and the contribution of the "modulinos" to the gravitational anomaly is $\delta_M = -3$, since there are only three untwisted moduli. Then the complete anomaly is with eq.(3.18):

$$\begin{aligned} b'_{\rm grav} &= 63 + 3 - 3 - 984 \\ &+ 3 \times (27+1) - 3 \times 7 \times 27 \\ &- 3 \times 7 \times (3+3+5+3+5+1+7+9) \end{aligned}$$

where the second line gives the untwisted and twisted matter contributions and the third line that of oscillator states. The reader can check that the total anomaly yields $-2160 = -24 \times 90$, as it should. One may get the wrong impression that multiple oscillator massless states appear only for gauge singlet particles. This is in fact true for (2,2) orbifolds (other than $\mathbf{Z}_3, \mathbf{Z}_4, \mathbf{Z}'_6$) but it certainly is not true for generic (0,2) models. An easy example of this may be obtained by examining a (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold studied in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.50"¿50(2.8)html:¡/A¿]. It is obtained by acting on one of the E_8's with the shift $\vec{\delta} = \frac{1}{7}(1,1,2,-2,-2,0,0,0)$ instead of the (2,2) shift. The gauge group of the model is $SU(7) \times SU(2) \times U(1) \times E_8$ and, for example, one can check that in the θ^2 twisted sector there are 7-plets of $SU(7)$ with double oscillators and overall modular weight -4. We have also checked that in this (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_7$ orbifold one has $b'_7 = b'_2 = b'_1 = b'_8 = b'_{\rm grav}/24 = -90$ and hence the mixed duality anomalies are all cancelled by a Green–Schwarz mechanism.

Appendix (2.8)html:¡A name="appendix.B"¿B.(2.8)html:¡/A¿ A $\mathbf{Z}_4$ example

As a second example for the computation of the anomaly coefficients and also for the determination of the unification masses we present a (0,2) $\mathbf{Z}_4$ orbifold, which was constructed in ref.[(2.8)html:¡A href="#reference.44"¿44(2.8)html:¡/A¿] (model No.2 in table 2 of this article). The $\mathbf{Z}_4$ twist vector acting on the internal six-torus is given by $\vec{\theta} = (1/2, 1/4, 1/4)$. Furthermore the model is defined by the non-standard embedding of the twist into the gauge group $E_8 \times E'_8$. Specifically, the embedding

is characterized by the following shift vector $\vec{\delta} = (1/2, 1/4, 1/4, 0^5; 1/2, 1/2, 0^6)$. This shift breaks the group $E_8 \times E_8'$ to the gauge group $G = [E_6 \times SU(2)_1 \times U(1)] \times [E_7 \times SU(2)_2]'$.

Let us now list the transformation properties and the corresponding modular weight vectors of the matter fields (we will omit to list the $U(1)$ quantum numbers). In the untwisted sector there are the following representations associated to the first complex plane:

$$\phi_{U_1} = (\underline{27}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + (\overline{\underline{27}}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + (\underline{1}, \underline{1}; \underline{56}, \underline{2}). \tag{B.1}$$

The corresponding modular weight vector looks like

$$\vec{n}_{U_1} = (-1, 0, 0). \tag{B.2}$$

Secondly, there are the following untwisted fields associated to the second and third complex plane:

$$\phi_{U_{2,3}} = (\overline{\underline{27}}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + (\underline{1}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}). \tag{B.3}$$

Here the corresponding modular weights are

$$\vec{n}_{U_2} = (0, -1, 0), \qquad \vec{n}_{U_3} = (0, 0, -1). \tag{B.4}$$

In the first twisted sector with twist vector $\vec{\theta}_1 = (1/2, 1/4, 1/4)$, there are the following states with no twisted oscillators:

$$\phi_{T_1} = 16(\underline{1}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{2}). \tag{B.5}$$

The corresponding modular weight vectors are given as

$$\vec{n}_{T_1} = (-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{3}{4}). \tag{B.6}$$

Furthermore, we find in this sector the states with a positive chirality oscillator with respect to either the second or the third complex plane ($p_{2,3} = 1$):

$$\phi_{T_1} = 16(\underline{1}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{2})^{p_2=1} + 16(\underline{1}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{2})^{p_3=1}. \tag{B.7}$$

Then the corresponding modular weight vectors have the form

$$\vec{n}_{T_1}^{p_2=1} = (-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{7}{4}, -\frac{3}{4}), \qquad \vec{n}_{T_1}^{p_3=1} = (-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{7}{4}). \tag{B.8}$$

In the second twisted sector with $\vec{\theta}_2 = (0, 1/2, 1/2)$ there are the following states with no oscillators:

$$\phi_{T_2} = 10(\underline{27}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + 6(\overline{\underline{27}}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}) + 16(\underline{1}, \underline{1}; \underline{1}, \underline{1}). \tag{B.9}$$

These states have modular weights

$$\vec{n}_{T_2} = (0, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}). \tag{B.10}$$

In addition, this sector possesses states with positive chirality oscillators:

$$\phi_{T_2} = 6(\underline{1}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{1})^{p_2=1} + 6(\underline{1}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{1})^{p_3=1}. \tag{B.11}$$

Here the modular weights are

$$\vec{n}^{p_2=1}_{T_2} = (0, -\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}), \qquad \vec{n}^{p_3=1}_{T_2} = (0, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}). \tag{B.12}$$

Finally there are 20 representations of this kind with negative chirality oscillators with respect to either the second or the third complex plane ($q_{2,3} = 1$):

$$\phi_{T_2} = 10(\underline{1}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{1})^{q_2=1} + 10(\underline{1}, \underline{2}; \underline{1}, \underline{1})^{q_3=1}. \tag{B.13}$$

This implies the following set of modular weights:

$$\vec{n}^{q_2=1}_{T_2} = (0, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}), \qquad \vec{n}^{q_3=1}_{T_2} = (0, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}). \tag{B.14}$$

Now, using eq.(3.6), we are ready to compute the anomaly coefficients for the four non-Abelian gauge group factors ($C(E_6) = 12$, $C(E_7) = 18$, $C(SU(2)) = 2$, $T(\underline{27}) = 3$, $T(\underline{56}) = 6$, $T(\underline{2}) = 1/2$):

$$\begin{aligned}
b'^{1}_{E_6} &= -12 + 3[2(-1) + 4(1) + 16(1)] = 42, \\
b'^{2,3}_{E_6} &= -12 + 3[2(-1) + 4(1) + 16(0)] = -6, \\
b'^{1}_{SU(2)_1} &= -2 + \frac{1}{2}[56(1) + 32(0) + 32(1)] = 42, \\
b'^{2,3}_{SU(2)_1} &= -2 + \frac{1}{2}[28(1) + 28(-1) + 32(-\frac{1}{2}) \\
&\quad + 6(-2) + 6(0) + 10(0) + 10(2)] = -6, \\
b'^{1}_{E_7} &= -18 + 6[2(-1)] = -30, \\
b'^{2,3}_{E_7} &= -18 + 6[2(1)] = -6, \\
b'^{1}_{SU(2)_2} &= -2 + \frac{1}{2}[56(-1) + 32(0) + 32(0)] = -30, \\
b'^{2,3}_{SU(2)_2} &= -2 + \frac{1}{2}[56(1) + 32(-\frac{1}{2}) + 16(-\frac{5}{2}) + 16(-\frac{1}{2})] = -6.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.15}$$

For the gravitational anomaly eq.(3.16) we obtain the following coefficients ($\delta_M^1 = 2$, $\delta_M^{2,3} = -2$):

$$\begin{aligned} b'^1_{\rm grav} &= 22 + 2 - 218 + 166(-1) + 112(1) + 128(0) + 512(1) = 264, \\ b'^{2,3}_{\rm grav} &= 22 - 2 - 218 + 166(1) + 56(1) + 56(-1) + 64(-\frac{1}{2}) \\ &\quad + 32(-\frac{5}{2}) + 32(-\frac{1}{2}) + 448(0) + 12(-2) + 12(0) + 20(2) + 20(0) = -144. \end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

Since the second and third complex plane are both rotated by $\vec{\theta}_1$ and $\vec{\theta}_2$, the anomaly coefficients with respect to these two planes agree: $b'^{2,3}_a = b'^{2,3}_{\rm grav}/24 = -6$.

The first plane provides a non-vanishing contribution to the threshold corrections. The relative unification masses M_X among the coupling constants of the four gauge group factors are given by

$$\frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = [(T_1 + \overline{T}_1)|\eta(T_1)|^4]^{\frac{b'^1_b - b'^1_a}{2(b_a - b_b)}}. \tag{B.17}$$

The relevant β-function coefficients are given as $b_{E_6} = 30$, $b_{E_7} = -42$, $b_{SU(2)_1} = b_{SU(2)_2} = 54$. Then we obtain the following unification masses M_X:

$$\begin{aligned} a = E_6, b = SU(2)_1 : &\qquad \frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = 1, \\ a = E_7, b = SU(2)_2 : &\qquad \frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = 1, \\ a = E_6, b = E_7 : &\qquad \frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = [(T_1 + \overline{T}_1)|\eta(T_1)|^4]^{-1/2} > 1, \\ a = E_6, b = SU(2)_2 : &\qquad \frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = [(T_1 + \overline{T}_1)|\eta(T_1)|^4]^{3/2} < 1, \\ a = E_7, b = SU(2)_1 : &\qquad \frac{M_X}{M_{\rm string}} = [(T_1 + \overline{T}_1)|\eta(T_1)|^4]^{-3/8} > 1. \end{aligned} \tag{B.18}$$

Table 1: List of all Abelian orbifolds with, in the second column, the corresponding twist vectors. The results for each case from the requirements of modular anomaly cancellation and coupling constant unification assuming the spectrum of the minimal supersymmetric standard model ($3/5k_1 = k_2 = k_3$) are shown in colums 3–6. + stands for an allowed model, whereas − rules out the particular case. A model with viable minimal unification must have a + in the last column.

Orbifold	$(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$	Anom. canc.	Unification $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ no anom. canc.	Unification $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ plus anom. canc.	Unification $T_1 >> T_2, T_3$ plus anom. canc.
$\mathbf{Z}_3$	$(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$	–	–	–	–
$\mathbf{Z}_4$	$(1/2, 1/4, 1/4)$	+	–	–	–
$\mathbf{Z}_6$	$(1/2, 1/3, 1/6)$	+	–	–	+
$\mathbf{Z}'_6$	$(2/3, 1/6, 1/6)$	+	–	–	–
$\mathbf{Z}_7$	$(4/7, 2/7, 1/7)$	–	–	–	–
$\mathbf{Z}_8$	$(1/2, 1/8, 3/8)$	+	–	–	–
$\mathbf{Z}'_8$	$(1/4, 1/8, 5/8)$	+	+	+	+
$\mathbf{Z}_{12}$	$(1/3, 1/12, 7/12)$	+	+	–	–
$\mathbf{Z}'_{12}$	$(1/2, 1/12, 5/12)$	+	+	–	–

Table 1: (continued)

Orbifold	$(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$	Anom. canc.	Unification $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ no anom. canc.	Unification $T = T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ plus anom. canc.	Unification $T_1 >> T_2, T_3$ plus anom. canc.
$\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$	$(1/2, 1/2, 0)$ $(0, 1/2, 1/2)$	+	−	−	+
$\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_4$	$(1/2, 1/2, 0)$ $(0, 1/4, 3/4)$	+	−	−	+
$\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$	$(1/2, 1/2, 0)$ $(0, 1/6, 5/6)$	+	+	+	+
$\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_6'$	$(1/2, 1/2, 0)$ $(1/6, 2/3, 1/6)$	+	−	−	+
$\mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_3$	$(1/3, 2/3, 0)$ $(0, 1/3, 2/3)$	+	−	−	+
$\mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$	$(1/3, 2/3, 0)$ $(0, 1/6, 5/6)$	+	+	+	+
$\mathbf{Z}_4 \times \mathbf{Z}_4$	$(1/4, 3/4, 0)$ $(0, 1/4, 3/4)$	+	−	−	+
$\mathbf{Z}_6 \times \mathbf{Z}_6$	$(1/6, 5/6, 0)$ $(0, 1/6, 5/6)$	+	−	−	+

Table 2: Kac–Moody conformal dimension of the standard model particles. The two rightmost columns give the value of the total conformal dimension for two choices of the levels consistent with GUT-like gauge coupling boundary conditions at the string scale.

	$SU(3)$	$SU(2)$	$U(1)$	Total($3/5 k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1$)	Total($3/5 k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 2$)
Q	$\frac{4}{9+3k_3}$	$\frac{3}{8+4k_2}$	$\frac{1}{36k_1}$	3/5	37/80
U	$\frac{4}{9+3k_3}$	0	$\frac{4}{9k_1}$	3/5	2/5
D	$\frac{4}{9+3k_3}$	0	$\frac{1}{9k_1}$	2/5	3/10
L, H	0	$\frac{3}{8+4k_2}$	$\frac{1}{4k_1}$	2/5	21/80
E	0	0	$\frac{1}{k_1}$	3/5	3/10

Table 3: Maximum allowed number of oscillators and allowed values of overall modulus modular weights for all possible twisted sectors of Abelian orbifolds.

$(\|v_1\|, \|v_2\|, \|v_3\|)$	$p_{\max}$	$q_{\max}$	$h_{KM} = \sum \|v_i\|^2/2$	$h_{KM} = 3/5\ (Q, U, E)$	$h_{KM} = 2/5\ (L, H, D)$
$(0, 0, 0)$	0	0	$n = -1$	$n = -1$	$n = -1$
$(1/3, 1/3, 2/3)$	1	0	$-3 \leq n \leq -2$	$n = -2$	$n = -2$
$(1/2, 1/4, 1/4)$	2	1	$-4 \leq n \leq -1$	$n = -2$	$-3 \leq n \leq -2$
$(1/3, 1/6, 1/6)$	4	2	$-6 \leq n \leq 0$	$n = -2$	$-4 \leq n \leq -1$
$(1/2, 1/3, 1/6)$	3	1	$-5 \leq n \leq -1$	$n = -2$	$-3 \leq n \leq -2$
$(3/7, 2/7, 1/7)$	4	1	$-6 \leq n \leq -1$	$n = -2$	$-4 \leq n \leq -2$
$(1/2, 1/8, 3/8)$	4	1	$-6 \leq n \leq -1$	$n = -2$	$-4 \leq n \leq -2$
$(1/4, 1/8, 3/8)$	5	1	$-7 \leq n \leq -1$	$-3 \leq n \leq -2$	$-4 \leq n \leq -2$
$(1/3, 1/12, 5/12)$	7	1	$-9 \leq n \leq -1$	$-3 \leq n \leq -2$	$-5 \leq n \leq -2$
$(1/2, 1/12, 5/12)$	6	1	$-8 \leq n \leq -1$	$-3 \leq n \leq -2$	$-5 \leq n \leq -2$
$(0, 1/2, 1/2)$	1	1	$-2 \leq n \leq 0$	$n = -1$	$n = -1$
$(0, 1/3, 1/3)$	2	2	$-3 \leq n \leq 1$	$n = -1$	$-2 \leq n \leq 0$
$(0, 1/4, 1/4)$	3	3	$-4 \leq n \leq 2$	$n = -1$	$-2 \leq n \leq 0$
$(0, 1/6, 1/6)$	5	5	$-6 \leq n \leq 4$	$-2 \leq n \leq 0$	$-3 \leq n \leq 1$

Table 4: Values of the weak mixing angle and α_3 in non-minimal models including extra massless chiral fields. The notation for each model is given in the text. The values of the parameters γ and A, B are also given.

	MODEL	$\sin^2\theta_W^0$	α_3^0	γ^0	A	B	B/A
	Minimal	0.218	0.20	2.7-3.7	28/5	20	25/7
a)	$O+T$	0.274	0.056	2.7-3.0	18/5	14	35/9
b)	$O+T+E+\overline{E}$	0.24	0.074	7.8-9.8	24/5	16	10/3
c)	$O+T+2(E+\overline{E})$	0.207	0.109	~ 0	6	18	3
d)	$O+T+H+\overline{H}+E+\overline{E}$	0.251	0.109	~ 0	22/5	18	45/11
e)	$D+\overline{D}$	0.207	0.109	~ 0	6	18	3
f)	$U+\overline{U}$	0.173	0.205	0.7-0.9	36/5	20	25/9
g)	$Q+\overline{Q}$	0.296	0.109	~ 0	14/5	18	45/7
h)	$D+\overline{D}+E+\overline{E}$	0.205	0.173	1.1-1.6	36/5	20	25/9
i)	$U+\overline{U}+Q+\overline{Q}$	0.251	0.109	~ 0	22/5	18	45/11
j)	$D+\overline{D}+Q+\overline{Q}$	0.285	0.075	1.0-1.3	16/5	16	5

References

¿1(2.8)html:¡/A¿] For a review see: A.N. Schellekens, *"Superstring Constructions"*, North Holland, Amsterdam (1989).

¿2(2.8)html:¡/A¿] R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, Comm. Math. Phys. **115** (1988) 649; *"On moduli spaces of conformal field theories with* $c \geq 1$*"*, preprint THU-87/30; A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B320** (1989) 669.

¿3(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Ferrara, D. Lüst, A. Shapere and S. Theisen, Phys. Lett. **B225** (1989) 363.

¿4(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J. Lauer, J. Mas and H.P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. **B226** (1989) 251; Nucl. Phys. **B351** (1991) 353; E.J. Chun, J. Mas, J. Lauer and H.-P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. **B233** (1989) 141.

¿5(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Ferrara, D. Lüst and S. Theisen, Phys. Lett. **B233** (1989) 147.

¿6(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Nucl. Phys. **B355** (1991) 649.

¿7(2.8)html:¡/A¿] I. Antoniadis, K.S. Narain and T.R. Taylor, Phys. Lett. **B267** (1991) 37.

¿8(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 401.

¿9(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Ferrara, N. Magnoli, T.R. Taylor and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 409.

¿10(2.8)html:¡/A¿] M. Cvetic, A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. **B361** (1991) 194.

¿11(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L. Dixon, J. Harvey, C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B261** (1985) 651; Nucl. Phys. **B274** (1986) 285.

¿12(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez, H.P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. **B187** (1987) 25; L.E. Ibáñez, J. Mas, H.P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. **B301** (1988) 157.

¿13(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. **B217** (1989) 272.

¿14(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J.P. Derendinger, S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and F. Zwirner, *"On loop corrections to string effective field theories: field-dependent gauge couplings and sigma-model anomalies"*, preprint CERN-TH.6004/91, LPTENS 91-4 (revised version) (1991), Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 307.

¿15(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J. Louis, *"Non-harmonic gauge coupling constants in supersymmetry and superstring theory"*, preprint SLAC-PUB-5527 (1991); V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, as quoted in J. Louis.

,16(2.8)html:¡/A¿] G. Lopes Cardoso and B. Ovrut, Nucl. Phys. **B369** (1992) 351; *"Sigma Model Anomalies, Non-Harmonic Gauge and Gravitational Couplings and String Theory,"* preprint UPR-0481T (1991).

,17(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez and D. Lüst, Phys. Lett. **B267** (1991) 51.

,18(2.8)html:¡/A¿] M.B. Green and J.H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **149B** (1984) 117.

,19(2.8)html:¡/A¿] V. Kaplunovsky, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 145.

,20(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B272** (1991) 251.

,21(2.8)html:¡/A¿] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. **B212** (1983) 413.

,22(2.8)html:¡/A¿] D.J. Gross, J.A. Harvey, E. Martinec and R. Rohm, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54** (1985) 502; Nucl. Phys. **B256** (1985) 253; Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1986) 75.

,23(2.8)html:¡/A¿] P. Candelas, G. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B258** (1985) 46.

,24(2.8)html:¡/A¿] K. Kikkawa and M. Yamasaki, Phys. Lett. **149B** (1984) 357; N. Sakai and I. Senda, Progr. Theor. Phys. **75** (1986) 692.

,25(2.8)html:¡/A¿] V.P. Nair, A. Shapere, A. Strominger and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B287** (1987) 402; B. Sathiapalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 1597; J.J. Atick and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B310** (1988) 291; R. Brandenberger and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. **B316** (1989) 391; A. Giveon, E. Rabinovici and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. **B322** (1989) 167; M. Dine, P. Huet and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B322** (1989) 301; J. Molera and B. Ovrut, Phys. Rev. **40** (1989) 1146; M. Duff, Nucl. Phys. **B335** (1990) 610; E. Alvarez and M.A.R. Osorio, Phys. Rev. **40** (1989) 1150; W. Lerche, D. Lüst and N.P. Warner, Phys. Lett. **B231** (1989) 417; M. Cvetic, J. Molera and B. Ovrut, Phys. Lett. **B248** (1990) 83.

,26(2.8)html:¡/A¿] P. Candelas, X. de la Ossa, P. Green and L. Parkes, Phys. Lett. **B258** (1991) 118; Nucl. Phys. **B359** (1991) 21.

,27(2.8)html:¡/A¿] D. Lüst, *"Duality Invariant Effective String Actions and Automorphic Functions for (2,2) String Compactifications"*, talk presented at the Workshop on String Theory, Trieste 1991, preprint CERN-TH.6143/91; *"Duality Invariant Effective String Actions and Minimal Superstring Unification"*, talk presented at the EPS-Conference, Geneva 1991, preprint CERN-TH.6259/91.

,28(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez, *"Topics in String Unification"*, talk given at the Workshop on Electroweak Physics Beyond the Standard Model, Valencia 1991, preprint CERN-TH.6342/91.

,29(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Ferrara, *"Geometry and Quantum Symmetries of Superstring Vacua,"* lecture given at the International School of Subnuclear Physics, Erice 1991, preprint CERN-TH.6213/91.

,30(2.8)html:¡/A¿] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **155B** (1985) 151.

,31(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Nucl. Phys. **B329** (1990) 27.

,32(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez, J.E. Kim, H.P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. **B191** (1987) 282; L.E. Ibáñez, J. Mas, H.P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. **B301** (1988) 157.

,33(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez, F. Quevedo and A. Sierra, Nucl. Phys. **B331** (1990) 421.

,34(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J.A. Casas, E.K. Katehou and C. Muñoz, Nucl. Phys. **B317** (1989) 171; J.A. Casas and C. Muñoz, Phys. Lett. **B214** (1988) 63.

,35(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. **B181** (1986) 263; M. Cvetic, J. Louis and B. Ovrut, Phys. Lett. **B206** (1988) 227.

,36(2.8)html:¡/A¿] V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, paper to appear.

,37(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. **B345** (1990) 389.

,38(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J. Ellis, J.L. López and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 375.

,39(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A.N. Schellekens and N.P. Warner, Nucl. Phys. **B287** (1987) 317.

,40(2.8)html:¡/A¿] M. Dine, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B289** (1987) 589; W. Lerche, B.E.W. Nilsson and A.N. Schellekens, Nucl. Phys. **B289** (1987) 609.

,41(2.8)html:¡/A¿] G. Moore and P. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53** (1984) 1519; L. Alvarez-Gaumé and P. Ginsparg, Nucl. Phys. **B262** (1985) 439; J. Bagger, D. Nemeschansky and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. **B262** (1985) 478; A. Manohar, G. Moore and P. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **152B** (1985) 68; W. Buchmüller and W. Lerche, Ann. Phys. **175** (1987) 159.

,42(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L. Dixon, talk given at the Berkeley conference, May 1991.

,43(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. **B365** (1991) 431.

,44(2.8)html:¡/A¿] Y. Katsuki, Y. Kawamura, T. Kobayashi, Y. Ono and K. Tanioka, Phys. Lett. **B218** (1989) 169.

,45(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J.A. Casas, M. Mondragon and C. Muñoz, Phys. Lett. **B230** (1989) 63.

,46(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J. E. Kim, Phys. Lett. **B207** (1988) 434; Seoul preprint SNUHE 90/01 (1990).

,47(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A. Casas, A. de La Macorra, M. Mondragon and C. Muñoz, Phys. Lett. **B247** (1990) 50; Y. Katsuki et al., Nucl. Phys. **B341** (1990) 611.

,48(2.8)html:¡/A¿] V. Kaplunosvky, unpublished notes.

,49(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J. Louis and D. Lüst, work in progress.

,50(2.8)html:¡/A¿] A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez, H.P. Nilles and F. Quevedo, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 109.

,51(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez, W. Lerche, D. Lüst and S. Theisen, Nucl. Phys. **B352** (1991) 435.

,52(2.8)html:¡/A¿] D. Lüst and C. Muñoz, *"Duality-Invariant Gaugino Condensation and One-loop Corrected Kähler Potentials in String Theory"*, CERN-TH.6358/91 (1991).

,53(2.8)html:¡/A¿] I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B205** (1988) 459, Phys. Lett. **B213** (1988) 56.

,54(2.8)html:¡/A¿] I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, R. Lacaze and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B268** (1991) 188; S. Kalara, J.L. Lopez and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B269** (1991) 84.

,55(2.8)html:¡/A¿] S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D24 (1981) 1681; L.E. Ibáñez and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **105B** (1981) 439; S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B193** (1981) 375; M. Einhorn and D.R.T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. **B196** (1982) 475.

,56(2.8)html:¡/A¿] G. Costa, J. Ellis, G.L. Fogli, D.V. Nanopolous and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. **B297** (1988) 244; J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B249** (1990) 441; Phys. Lett. **260B** (1991) 131; P. Langacker, *"Precision tests of the standard model",* Pennsylvania preprint UPR-0435T, (1990); U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. **B260** (1991) 447; P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys.Rev.**D44** (1991) 817; R. Roberts and G.G. Ross, preprint RAL-92-005 (1992).

,57(2.8)html:¡/A¿] I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 31.

,58(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez, Phys. Lett. **126B** (1983) 196; J.E. Bjorkman and D.R.T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. **B259** (1985) 533.

,59(2.8)html:¡/A¿] For a recent review see L.E. Ibáñez, *"Beyond the Standard Model (yet again)"*, CERN preprint TH.5982/91, to appear in the Proceedings of the 1990 CERN School of Physics, Mallorca (1990).

,60(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J.P. Derendinger, L.E. Ibáñez and H.P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. **155B** (1985) 65; M. Dine, R. Rohm, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **156B** (1985) 55.

,61(2.8)html:¡/A¿] J.P. Derendinger, L.E. Ibáñez and H.P Nilles, Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1986) 365.

,62(2.8)html:¡/A¿] H.P. Nilles and M. Olechowski, Phys. Lett. **B248** (1990) 268; P. Binetruy and M.K. Gaillard, Phys. Lett. **B253** (1991) 119; J. Louis, *"Status of Supersymmetry*

Breaking in String Theory", SLAC-PUB-5645 (1991); D. Lüst and T.R. Taylor, Phys. Lett. **B253** (1991) 335; B. Carlos, J. Casas and C. Muñoz, Phys. Lett. **B263** (1991) 248; S. Kalara, J. Lopez and D. Nanopoulos, *"Gauge and Matter Condensates in Realistic String Models"*, preprint CTP-TAMU-69/91.

,63(2.8)html:¡/A¿] L.E. Ibáñez and H.P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. **169B** (1986) 354.

,64(2.8)html:¡/A¿] K. Inoue et al., Prog.Theor.Phys. **68** (1982) 927; L.E. Ibáñez, Nucl. Phys. **B218** (1983) 514; L.E. Ibáñez and C. López, Phys. Lett. **126B** (1983) 54; Nucl. Phys. **B233** (1984) 511; L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. Polchinsky and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B221** (1983) 495.